T. JAMES & CO.
BOOKSELLERS & BOOK BUYERS
34 BERNARD STREET,
Estab. 1849] Southampton

LIBRARY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

PRINCETON, N. J.

BX 5099 .P34 1883
Palmer, William, 1803-1885.
A narrative of events
connected with the

A NARRATIVE OF EVENTS

CONNECTED WITH THE PUBLICATION

OF THE

Tracts for the Times.

A

NARRATIVE OF EVENTS

CONNECTED WITH THE PUBLICATION OF THE

Tracts for the Times

With an Introduction and Supplement extending to the Present Time

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
7 - 1928
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BY

WILLIAM PALMER

AUTHOR OF "ORIGINES LITURGICÆ," "A TREATISE ON THE CHURCH OF CHRIST," ETC., ETC.

RIVINGTONS

WATERLOO PLACE, LONDON

MDCCCLXXXIII.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

https://archive.org/details/narrativeofevent00palm

PREFACE.

The work of which the following is a reprint, received some attention at the period of its publication in 1843, when several thousand copies were in circulation in England; and a still larger number in America. It happened to be connected with important events in the Oxford Movement of 1833, which have however been almost forgotten; and the work itself has become a rarity.

A wish has been expressed in various quarters, arising from a recent publication of mine in the *Contemporary Review* (May, 1883) on the "Oxford Movement," that, as the last surviving member of the English Church who took part in the initiation of that movement, I should discuss the subject at greater length, and in connexion with the "Narrative" here reprinted. That narrative, it is true, was compiled to meet a peculiar exigency of the Church (happily no longer existing); but will, it is hoped, furnish a convenient basis, from its historical character, for further and fuller observations on the progress of the movement

and its results in their bearing upon the Church of England. The author attempts this task with a deep sense of the imperfections of the opinions here expressed, more especially when they relate to the motives and feelings of others.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	Preparatory Events—The Reformation	1
II.	Wesleyan Revival	10
III.	Dangers of Religion, 1833	19
IV.	Altered Position of the State	34
V.	Awakening of the Church, 1833	37
VI.	Proceedings of the Association of Friends of the Church, 1833, 1834	48
VII.	The Tractarian Movement	54
VIII.	Change in the Attitude of Tractarianism	66

THE NARRATIVE.

I.	The Association of Friends of the Church in 1833—Its Results	95
II.	Tracts for the Times—The Hampden Controversy	119
III.	Party-Spirit—Tendency to Romanism	136
IV.	Church Principles stated—Duties of Churchmen—Prospects of Church Principles	183
	Appendix, comprising Additional Notes, and Correspondence	208

SUPPLEMENT TO THE NARRATIVE.

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	Division of Tractarianism, and Fall of the Romanizing Party	233
II.	Revival of Synodal Action with Lay Co-operation	244
III.	Revival of Pastoral Diligence and of the Church	254
IV.	Adverse Circumstances	269
	Conclusion	292

INTRODUCTION.

CHAPTER I.

PREPARATORY EVENTS—THE REFORMATION.

We have to trace, however imperfectly, the fortunes of one of those great movements of Christianity which may be among the last which are to prepare us to receive the coming Saviour. We find it impossible not to connect the movement with a series of preparatory events, in which the watchful care of the Divine Head of Christianity has been manifested, and in which the insidious workings of the great enemy of souls may be also traced—the contest being for the preservation of the witness of this great Church, or its extinction by the powers of darkness.

It is of the essence of that state of trial in which man's soul and body are placed in this mortal life, preparatory to the eternal existence beyond the grave, that evil as well as good should be here permitted to try the children of men, whether they will be faithful in the great combat between good and evil.

A faultless world and a faultless Church would have been inconsistent with the incarnation and atonement of the Eternal Son of God; inconsistent with all that Christianity offers in the assurance of the forgiveness of sins; inconsistent with that liability to fall into sin; so sadly known to all genuine Christians. They feel and they know how weak our nature is, how inclined to sin; and

they feel experimentally, and by all that passes before their eyes, that this world is but a field overspread with tares, in which indeed the good seed springeth up and beareth fruit, but in which the tares of error and corruption are ever widely prevalent, and full of vitality.

To believers it often seems as if the work of Christ is overborne, and evil obtains ascendency over men, even over the Lord's household and family; and they deeply mourn over the prevalence of sin, and of utter infidelity, and are amazed at the endurance of God, who leaves iniquities and blasphemies unpunished in this life, and permits wicked men to pursue their career of guilt without check or impediment. But while many a soul is sinking beneath the weight of its personal trial, and while many a soul is desponding for the cause of God, which seems overborne by the cause of Satan, the great trial which God appoints to man is proceeding. Man judges by external effects whether the cause of God is advancing or falling. But it was not the purpose of the Creator to make a faultless world or a faultless Church, or to ensure the triumph of good over evil at all times during this life. His great test is within—whether the individual soul is in relations of religion towards Him—whether it passes rightly through the trial of life. That trial is for ever going on, and no human eye can behold it. It involves the great inquiry, "Is religion to me a reality? am I walking with God?" The outward features of religion, even of objective and revealed truth, are subordinate to the salvation of particular souls. They are means to an end.

Christian souls as they pass through the furnace of trial are judged, and at last transferred from this life to the abodes which will be theirs throughout eternity after the judgment of the great day, when they shall have accomplished the good work they were created to finish,

or shall have fallen short of the prize of their high calling in Christ Jesus, and received that heritage of tribulation and woe destined for all who do evil.

Hence it is that in the chosen field of God's election out of the world a mingled scene of good and evil meets us on every hand. In that chosen body which bears Christ's name, many tares, many errors, many divisions, many failings abound, as every one admits; yet the promise still remains true—"the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." God's ways are not as our ways, or His thoughts as our thoughts. He looks from on high, and with higher objects and ends than we understand. We are but children and idiots before Him, even the wisest of us. Who but looks on this matchless world—this product of skill evidently unapproachable by man—can doubt of His all-comprehensive power and wisdom and knowledge? Can human or progressive knowledge, which can scarcely realize even what is visible, conceive the power which called those things into being, and has left its impress on the infinity of creation and its every detail?

But we—what are we but children in the presence of that Divine and Infinite wisdom? And yet we wonder to think that He can have created a moral world in which He permits faults to exist. We are blind to His object—the moral trial of man.

It was this that permitted the growth of Judaic and heretical innovations which, in number legion, assailed the faith of Christians, and did that work which Infidelity and Ultramontanism are now continuing.

It was this that permitted Arianism to overrun the Church, to receive the support of the temporal power, and at one time to be apparently ascendant. But God who permitted the prevalence of evil, raised up at length instruments for the purposes of reviving faith when it was in danger of extinction.

If in Montanism the Church was deeply troubled by a heresy derived from Oriental philosophy, which substituted a new righteousness—the righteousness of fasts, celibacy, and ceremonial observances—for the true righteousness of a renewed heart and soul, He caused it to be resisted, though supported by the greatest names, and left it as a sore to trouble the Church, yet prevented it from becoming an article of the faith.

When Arianism proclaimed the worship of the Son as a creature, Athanasius was raised up to denounce this doctrine as an inlet to heathenism, because it established creature-worship in principle, and the principle of religion which worshipped the Creator only was abandoned. And when in later times images were introduced, and began to receive worship as well as other material objects, and heathenism again began to prevail in the Church and to furnish objects of religion to man, great witnesses were raised up to contend against principles and practices destructive of the very principle of Christianity. The witnesses and undaunted confessions and labours of Serenus and Claudius, of the synods and emperors of the East, of the synods of Frankfort and Paris in the West, for many ages kept in check the torrent of heathen and idolatrous practices, until at length resistance was overcome by the unhappy influence of the Papacy—"the mother" of superstitions and errors.

As a trial God permitted the rapid growth of the Roman usurpation, which from the fifth century outstripped all others, and to which even kings and emperors were forced to bend and to become its vassals and slaves—a power which identifying itself with the first article of the Christian Creed, and assuming as of Divine right the delegated power of God Himself, cannot, if it would, relinquish any of its pretensions; and which its adherents

are bound consistently to maintain and to advance as parts of religion itself. To yield any one of these pretensions would be to acknowledge that it has been guilty of blasphemy, and to destroy its power. To obey it is represented as the first duty of believers, and salvation depends upon it. And hence (when the evil threatened to destroy religion) the counteraction which the Papacy experienced in its ambitious scheme of universal dominion and the absorption of all power and wealth on earth, by two great movements (the work of Jesus Christ) the rise of Gallicanism, and the contemporaneous rise of the Reformation.

Boniface VIII., at the end of the fourteenth century, carried to the extremest height these demands and pretensions to temporal and spiritual empire, which had for ages oppressed Christendom, and converted the world into a human shambles, or into a Papal monarchy, absolute over the soul as well as the body. At length endurance failed, and France, under Philip le Bel, revolted from the monstrous pretensions of Rome, and assumed freedom. The Gallican system included in principle that of the Reformation. It asserted the necessity for proof, instead of a blind submission to the actual Papal dictation. Hence its appeal was throughout to the tradition of the Church, the remains of apostolic Christianity, against the bold assertion of the Papacy—to the Fathers, the Councils, the Scriptures, the Universal Church, against the mere authority of a particular hierarch supposed to be the representative Deity.

And from this sprang the principle of the Reformation, which equally consisted in an appeal from the Roman to the Universal Church, and to the Scripture as the apostolic record of the faith. Hence Gallicanism and Protestantism were in principle the same, and they are equally denounced as heresy by the Ultramontane party.

It is a remarkable fact, that as France had been the earliest defender of the Papacy (whence its kings were adorned by the Popes with the title of the "Most Christian King"), to whom the Papacy was indebted for its temporal monarchy in 756, so it was also France that was the first kingdom in Europe to break the yoke of servitude to Rome, and to revive the appeal to the Church and to Catholic tradition, and to uphold the temporal rights of kings against the usurpations of the Papacy; and it was France that first overthrew the temporal dominion of the Papacy.

And in England a still more remarkable case presents itself. England in its earlier days (as Ranke has well shown) was distinguished among European nations for its subservience to the Papacy, in virtue of which its kings at one time became vassals of the Pope, and yet in the end England became the greatest witness whom God raised up to overthrow the dominion and devices of that spiritual and temporal usurpation, and to be the witness against it in the face of the world—a witness which the Papacy has ever regarded as its most potent antagonist, and which it has used infinite exertions to destroy either by the sword or by sophistry and flatteries.

Such has been the course of the Papacy, and in the intellectual world its gyrations in pursuit of power have been endless, until at last we have seen it neutralize its own assumption of infallibility, and readopt the Gallican and Protestant principles which it has denounced, by Minimism, the latest product of Papal ingenuity and inconsistency. *Magna est veritas.*

The century when Gallicanism, in the time of Philip le Bel, came forth, and gained the ascendant in the Councils of Constance and Basle (which reduced the Papal power into subjection to that of the Church) gave birth to the Reformation in England under Wycliffe.

Under that great reformer the great work was against the Papal Usurpation and the enormous evils which it brought upon the Church—the money-making, the taxation, the corruption, the luxury, the conversion of the Church into a temporal kingdom ruled by the Papacy and administered by the monks. Hence evils deep and intolerable, against which Christianity bore witness most boldly amidst threats and persecutions beyond telling. It is remarkable, too, that this great witness on behalf of revealed Truth went forth from Oxford, the great intellectual centre of England, famed for its intellectual ascendency amongst all the Churches of the world. It was the first "Oxford Movement."

Wycliffe and those who adopted his doctrines in opposition to the Papacy—the great centre of worldliness and idolatry, and whence all evil influence was perpetually flowing upon all the clergy—were little aware of the great consequences which were to follow from their efforts in one corner of Europe—little conscious of the effects to result from their intrepid manifestation of the Gospel.

They little dreamt that the flame raised here in England would be quenched in the blood of its advocates, through the machinations of the Papacy and subserviency of the priesthood and the temporal power, but that it would not fail to produce its results elsewhere; that it would break forth in Germany and Bohemia, and produce heroic martyrdoms for the Truth; that when repressed by the persecuting rage of the pontiffs and emperors, it would again shine forth, and triumph over a thousand persecutions and all the power of the Enemy, in the Lutheran reformation; that it would thence return to the land of its birth, and in England win the crown of martyrdom and the confessor's glorious name; that here in England it would struggle with the dragon of sophistry and error, and prove victorious; that it would be then beset by foes,

liable to the danger of hidden enemies, assailed by foreign war, weakened by domestic divisions, and yet triumphant over all, until it had converted this Church and nation into the grand bulwark of Truth throughout Europe. And this great fabric arose, as it were, without builder. "There was heard no hammer or axe or tool of iron." The names of the restorers of the temple of the Lord in the far West were not conspicuous. It has been often said that the English Reformers were not remarkable for their genius or their worldly renown. They were weak and fallible men. They had but one surpassing glory—a glory above all the gifts of mightier men—the glory of martyrdom—that unconquerable love of Christ which prompted them to render up their lives in vindication of the truths of the Gospel, and in protest against heathenism under the name of Christianity. It was martyrdom that restored and consolidated the sacred edifice in England. It was this Christian heroism, based upon a true faith, which has produced indelible effects upon the English mind. It was this martyrdom which secured for England her precious formularies, the Christian Prayer Book, the Christian worship, the Christian ministry, the settled convictions and the blessing which have attended on their use, the presence of Christ with His Church perpetual and unfailing. The Church of the martyrs has been preserved amidst the most desperate assaults.

There are those who see the strength of the forces arrayed against the truth. They refuse to bend the knee and confess that "not unto us, but unto Thy name give glory." But we should look to another comfort. Look at the wonderful care of God in ordaining that, notwithstanding Roman treasons and Protestant divisions, the good seed of the Word should grow and flourish, and cause a salutary jealousy of innovations on that truth so triumphantly established

by the Reformation, at a period when monarchy in England was beset by Roman attacks from without and from within; when the Jesuits were not sent in vain from Rome to advocate regicide and the forcible overthrow of the State; when Romish agencies, and Romish intrigues, and Roman absolutism led to the times of James II. and the results; and Roman absolutism at length showed itself upon the throne in its true colours, and brought about revolution.

The deep-dyed moral corruption of the Stuart dynasty, combined with Roman superstition and that of Louis XIV. and the French Court, brought on Europe the plague of a general corruption of manners, and the Divine judgment brought down on man the heaviest chastisement for his sins. Christianity was derided, wars decimated the human race. Impiety daringly produced deistic sophistries against religion. The work of God was coming to nought; the salt had lost its saltness. It was time for the Lord to interfere for the preservation of the faith, which was nearly overthrown.

CHAPTER II.

WESLEYAN REVIVAL.

When Christianity was thus growing faint amidst general corruption, help came to it, not from human wisdom or contrivance, not from the wisdom of Church or State, not from learning or intellectual power or philosophy, but from the meanest, the most humble, the most obscure sources. It was not the bishops and learned men who were enabled to turn the tide, though they strove manfully. It was the despised and obscure preachers of the Gospel. By "foolishness" the world was saved.

A "Second Movement," like that of Wycliffe, broke forth from the University of Oxford. Three young men arose, the two Wesleys and Whitefield—without station—graduates or undergraduates—and began the work of evangelization. They began by preaching in the prisons, they preached the Gospel of repentance for the remission of sins—a change of heart. They went forth, without learning, to awaken their brethren slumbering in trespasses and sins—the virgins sleeping at their posts. Not by wisdom, but by the foolishness of preaching like the apostles they won the world. Their work was irregular, beyond all common rules. They preached no profound doctrines gathered by man's ingenuity out of the Scriptures—no philosophy with its endless theories and vain illusions and contradictory conclusions—but simply re-

pentance from dead works, and conversion to the living God—conversion to Him who completed the work of man's redemption on Calvary. Their forms of expression were sometimes rude or inaccurate, but their meaning in general was to recall a dead or dying world to the first principle of its religion, salvation through Christ—conversion with all the heart to God. And hence the marvellous and magnificent success which attended their work, hence the heaven-descended power which caused the human heart, even of the very least and most illiterate, to respond to the call of heaven, to turn with bitter tears from its iniquities, and place itself under the dominion of the Most High. In comparison of such a work, which was national, and from whose influence no class or order of men was exempt, what are the minor points in which human infirmity may have shown itself in that direction? We can forgive everything—even Wesley's and Whitefield's mistakes—for the sake of the fervent testimony they bore to Christ, and to the cardinal doctrines of the Gospel which they unceasingly preached.

It was from this great movement that a reflex action passed over the whole Church of England. A part indeed of those who had been converted fell for a time into separation; (one of those evils which we have to lament, and by which Satan has often contrived to render imperfect, or to mar the greatest works of believers.) But the effect on the whole Church of England was revivifying. Hence the stimulus applied to such men as Romaine, Cadogan, Newton, Cowper, Scott, Bickersteth, Martyn, Wilberforce—especially to the last, who, in his "Practical View" set forth before all classes, rich and poor, their paramount duties to Christianity, and the exalted hopes and promises on which these duties rested—and all strove together with one mind to glorify God in Christ; all fervently believed and faithfully preached the

grand essential doctrines of revealed truth handed down from the beginning in the apostolic baptismal creeds. Defects in expression and in minor points might be pointed out by a hostile ingenuity in the religious system of the Evangelicals and of their opponents, as well as in that of the Wesleyans. Alas! what human representations of the revealed truth are wholly free from human infirmity? We can only see that the cardinal truths of Christianity are secured against being lost, and that the doctrines of the superstructure are guarded with most fidelity in the purest Christian Churches. And through God's special mercy bestowed upon the English branch of the universal Church, "the gold, silver, and precious stones" of the superstructure are here innumerable, while the "wood, hay, and stubble" of human doctrines, have been reduced to a minimum, save the errors of individuals.

When the author commenced his religious life—that is, when he first felt interest in religious subjects—the Evangelical system was in its full force and efficacy. And gladly does he bear witness to the sincerity with which it proclaimed Christ; gladly does he bear witness to the fervid devotion which characterized many of its members, to whom to live was Christ, and to die was gain; gladly does he witness to their earnest and exhaustless efforts to glorify God in their generation. If they were somewhat narrow in their views as regarded certain truths of the Gospel, which they made party Shibboleths, we can only attribute it to the imperfection of human reason, which is not always able to preserve the due proportion of truth, but exalts certain truths beyond their comparative importance—a fault common to all developments of Christianity, and not peculiar to Evangelicals. Jealous, too, of human righteousness, in place of the righteousness which is by faith of Jesus Christ,

their language sometimes seemed to undervalue or despise good works, though they wholly and with indignation rejected Antinomianism. In fact, to state the true Christian doctrine of justification by faith, which (if it have opportunity) bringeth forth good works, has always been liable to a charge of Antinomianism. It was so in the time of St. Paul, and it was so in the time of the Reformation; it is so now. The true remedy is to follow the course which the Fathers and Reformers did —to preach good works, but also to preach the sole saving merits of Christ. The fault of some of the Evangelicals was to feel a jealousy of the mention of good works, even as evidences of faith; lest men should trust in them for salvation. Their doctrine also had the tendency of undervaluing the necessity of baptism, though it was not intended.

There was a time, however, when these good Evangelicals formed the minority in the Church. They were for a long time looked on with jealousy and distrust, and they did not obtain the higher ministries in the Church. The author was trained up, not in their system, but in the ordinary principles of the Church of England. He never was a disciple of the Evangelical school. His friends and relations were of the general Church school. He was diligently taught his catechism, and examined by the clergy before his confirmation. Immediately after, he was prepared with prayer and careful instruction for the receipt of the Holy Communion. His parents were religious. One could never receive the sacrament without the deepest emotion; the other was a devoted Christian, who lived in the presence of God. Amongst near relations was one who was rather an angel than a human being—one whose every word and every act were marked by the impress of Divine grace—one whom it was impossible even for the

world not to love. That most holy and harmless of men fell a victim to the cause of Christ. He endured a bloody death for Christ's sake, in the calm discharge of duty, for the profession of his faith.

I compare the state of the Church then with its state now. Is the Church now a greater instrument for bringing souls to heaven than it then was? Has it improved in sanctity? Do we see more fervid devotion? God alone can tell. We only see the surface of things; we cannot read the heart; but this we see, that as the world judges, that is in external appearances, the Church of England has in many respects improved since those days. In some perhaps it may have gone backwards. Attention is more keenly directed towards religion; it is more active; but it is a question whether it is as rich in assured faith and childlike submission. The outward works are indeed great and noble; and as far as regards them we must confess to a great improvement. Yet we must remember that in past times the State took part in supplying the education and the spiritual wants of the Church. The Church trusted to the State's piety, and it was not until the State withdrew its preference from the Church, and made common cause with her adversaries, that Christianity was compelled to call out all her inherent forces; and the changes which we have witnessed are in some degree the result. Thus out of evil the Divine Ruler and Aid of Christianity has brought forth good.

But there are too many who imagine that because the Church sixty or seventy years since was very different from what it now is, the state of things must necessarily have been very bad. And there are those who delight in anecdotes about bishops and clergy who disgraced their profession. Such things there always will be and always have been, but one must, in judging of a body,

judge by its general mode of action and spirit; and looking on both, one who has seen both can say that, in this wider view, and taking all circumstances into account, there is not so great a difference as is usually thought.

The notions of pastoral vigilance, the modes of action, have greatly changed, and more is expected from modern knowledge of duty, but that there was less zeal in acting up to known duties than there now is, I for one do not believe. What is true is, that our views of Christian duty have expanded in time.

And as regards the great end for which religion and Christianity were instituted, let us bear in mind that this great end—namely, the trial of the soul—has been proceeding amidst greater and less knowledge—greater and less exertion externally—that it depends not on the amount of labour actually employed, but on the question whether we act in the right spirit, in the true faith.

And now to speak of the general state of religion in England after the Wesleyan revival. Be it remembered that in the latter part of the last century Europe had been visited by the desolating storm of infidelity. And from whence did that storm break forth? Was it from the Reformation, which up to this hour is accused by every Roman Catholic theologian of being infidel in principle and the cause of infidelity? How innumerable have been the souls which have been deceived by those loud and positive assertions into the belief that their religion is based on irreligion and unbelief! Where did infidelity spring from in the eighteenth century? From that country which, through the persuasions of the Papacy, had long embrued its hands in the blood of Protestants, and the persecution of the Jansenists, who adopted the same principles, and that of Gallicanism. It came forth from France—from the country where Jesuitism had long been

rampant and triumphant, and where the Scriptures had been suppressed as eagerly by superstition as by infidelity itself. From this Roman Catholic country—the masterpiece of Jesuit ingenuity—sprang forth the plague of infidelity which in a brief space overran all the countries of Europe, and which by a Divine Nemesis was followed by blood and revolution. Is infidelity complained of? It sprang from the Papal and Jesuit rule in France. It was this that sealed up the Scriptures and destroyed the rational appeal to history and fact, to substitute the reign of arrogant assertion. Accordingly they were successful: in every part of Europe the Word of God at the French revolution was shut, and Christianity had become a mockery. In all but one: that one was Britain; the lamp of faith still burned brightly there. In Britain's faith Christianity still found its resting-place.

In the midst of the triumph of infidel principle, when the world for a time found itself unbelieving, and fashion had turned the Bible and the facts of Revelation into ridicule, and had, in insult, established a new religion, and worshipped the goddess of reason; when priests and bishops were proscribed and murdered; when churches were closed, and the Pope himself by Divine justice became a fugitive and a vagabond—then, when external religion was overthrown and closed—then in Faith's last extremity, British faith uplifted once more the banner of the Gospel. In calm confidence and in the fullest reliance on the aid of God, who has in so many places recommended the study of the Scriptures; confident that this was a central point in Christianity in which all Christians could take a part, Christians in England set on foot the magnificent Christian work of the British and Foreign Bible Society, which undertook to circulate the Scriptures without note or comment in every nation under heaven.

It was from Britain that this grand Christian movement—the great work of the nineteenth century, the supplement of Wesley's great Revival—arose. That bold, aggressive movement once more made Christianity the teacher of the world—silent, indeed, but not less effectual. It was, as it were, another Pentecost, another preaching of the Gospel in all lands, even amongst its foes, a banner displayed in the face of an unbelieving world, an uplifting of the cardinal truths of the faith, a bold testimony, patent to all men, that the human race still clung to the worship of the Creator and Saviour.

For the movement at once spread to all countries. It was hailed even in distant Russia. It was received with transports of joy by believers in all countries, even by all that was best and most Christian in the Roman priesthood. All joined in acknowledging by their association with the Bible Society, the paramount claims, the undoubted authority of revealed Truth.

This was the grand result brought about by God's preservation of His own cause in Britain. The whole world became its debtor. Britain stood at the head of Christian nations. God had made it His great witness upon earth in the latter days. He caused it to be His evangelizing agency for the preservation and proclaiming of the truth, when the Papacy and all its devices had utterly failed. Shall not that great work be borne in memory, and rewarded by continued aid, as of old?

It is very true that this great movement had its defects. It was felt by many that association in a common religious work of those who were faithful to the Church with those who had separated from it, amounted to a compromise of the cause of truth; and certainly the claims of that great work were sometimes advocated on Latitudinarian principles which caused great scandal. Thus some felt scruples in joining in that work, and

preferred to act strictly in Church societies having the same general objects; but the support of such societies needed not have hindered men from co-operating in the larger and more simple work of circulating the Bible only.

In the meantime the Church of England remained firm and faithful in the service of God. He had sustained it amidst infinite dangers from without and within; had alone upheld it in its sustained efforts to resist a world in arms against it; had inspired an immovable resolution into the great men who defended its doctrines; had blessed the nation for its sake; and given victory to its armies against tremendous odds; until at last it saw the collapse and destruction of the mightiest armies and the most stupendous power of modern history, according to that saying: "Fret not thyself because of evil-doers, neither be thou envious against the workers of iniquity: for they shall soon be cut down like the grass, and wither as the green herb. . . . Yet a little while and the wicked shall not be, yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place and it shall not be. . . . The wicked plotteth against the just, and gnasheth upon him with his teeth. The Lord shall laugh at him, for He seeth that His day is coming."

CHAPTER III.

DANGERS OF RELIGION, 1833.

ENGLAND'S faithful adherence to the faith and worship of God amidst surrounding apostasy, was had in remembrance before God, and He poured blessings upon this nation, wide and deep and unrivalled. He gave to it victory, and made it the head of all the nations, so that the supremacy of England amidst all the nations was a long established fact. England was filled to overflowing with glory and power. Wealth flowed into her coffers from innumerable sources. The commerce of the whole world centred in her. Wealth from manufacturing industry attained unparalleled dimensions. But in this immense prosperity lay hid the secret dangers ever attendant on the possession of enormous prosperity. Overgrown prosperity engendered pride and forgetfulness of Him from whose bounty it all proceeded. The world —even in England—became full of vain and irreligious men who forgot God's "wonders of old time." A new generation arose which knew not God in His great works. They deemed that all those favours and blessings had come from man himself, and they practically ignored the being of God. They occupied themselves in petty disputes or philosophical speculations. A school arose whose conceit led them to imagine that their wisdom was sufficient to correct and amend the whole world. The

Church itself produced some such vain reasoners, who with boundless freedom began to investigate all institutions, to search into the basis of religious doctrines, and to put forth each his wild theory or irreverential remark. All was pretended to be for the benefit of free discussion, which was substituted for the claims of truth. This school came from Oriel College. In the meantime other counteracting influences arose. The Papacy had been restored to its temporal dominions and to its full ecclesiastical power in 1801 and 1814 by the European powers, headed by England, and the first act of the Papacy was to issue bulls for the revival of the order of Jesuits and the prevention of the circulation of the Bible. The English Government was indifferent on the subject, and let the Pope do as he pleased. Many had expected that the Papacy was to fall during the wars of the French Revolution, but events showed that this view was not that intended by prophecy. For the Papacy speedily reacquired its power upon the ending of the revolutionary wars, and that power which has now flourished for seventy years longer, is destined to give way before events yet future. At the end of the revolutionary war of twenty-five years, the Papacy, after a very narrow escape from extinction, rose again as "a giant refreshed with wine," and went on its way rejoicing. It was triumphant, as it continued to be till the era of its greatest exaltation, in 1870. The cause of truth beheld the greatest of its adversaries revive, prepared to thwart and oppose it at every turn, while at the same time the temporal power refused its support, and took up the cause of the adversary.

We must distinguish in these latter times between the English nation and the English Government. The former has been for the whole of this century opposed to the Roman system. The latter has, during the same period,

aided and encouraged it, and will continue to do so more and more; but it is vested with temporal authority, and the nation is not; therefore the will of the nation is always disregarded.

After a time, then, a period of religious decline set in in England. It was permitted as a judgment for its ingratitude, and as a means of rousing it from its growing apathy, to be visited by infidel and subversive doctrines. England was fast "settling upon its lees." The world was forgetting God. Men began to imagine that human power had created all things; that there was no Creator, no Controller of events. Allusions to God's being and providence became distasteful to the English parliament. They were voted ill-bred and superstitious; they were the subjects of ridicule, as overmuch righteousness. Men were ashamed any longer to say family prayers, or to invoke the blessing of God upon their partaking of His gifts; the food which He alone had provided. The mention of His name was tabooed in polite circles. In proportion as religion openly declined in society, a humanizing element progressed in religion under the name of philosophy and science, which knew of nothing except what is of human origin, and caused the supernatural to disappear. The consequence, of course, was that society began to demand the exclusion of the supernatural from the Christian system, on the pretence of wishing to make it more widely acceptable. They did not consider that to exclude the supernatural is at one blow to destroy Christianity, to convict it of being an imposture and a lie—a system which assumes the appearance of that which is utterly denied.

The author is here reluctantly obliged to introduce some mention of his own case, as of one young man amongst the multitude of Churchmen; in no way distinguished among them. He was at that time a young man entering

life. He had just graduated at an early age. He had, like many other young men of his standing, felt a strong interest in religious subjects, but he had no party tendencies. He was neither Evangelical nor anti-Evangelical, but followed the teaching of the Church as it was received. It had, however, now become his duty to study more accurately the tenets of his religion. He occupied, therefore, four years in fixing his principles. He examined with great care the evidence upon which the truth of Revelation rests, considered the objections raised, and remained satisfied that the testimonies on behalf of Revelation and the miracles, and the wonders of Creation, furnished a conclusive evidence of truth, and that infidelity has no ground to rest on except that which amounts to assumption or false logic. He was convinced also by the contradictions of infidelity and rationalism (a subject well treated by the Archbishop of York in the introduction to Canon Cooke's Commentary, and which ought to be pursued). On examining the creeds and formularies of the Church of England he remained satisfied that they are in accordance with the Scriptures, and cheerfully subscribed them as his own sentiments. He took account of all objections which had been raised to them.

He had been present at a controversy in which two combatants, for the sake of instructing students in the arguments for and against the Roman Catholic system, had publicly disputed; producing the arguments of the opposite parties; and though the author wished the Protestant advocate to succeed, he could not conceal from himself that this disputant, though very able, and arguing the point on ultra-Protestant grounds, was in fact not conclusive in his reasoning, and that the Roman Catholic advocate had the advantage over his opponent.

Several Roman Catholic books of controversy were

named in this argument as containing the Roman argument, and the author, feeling a curiosity on the subject, and willing to examine fairly all that could be said upon it, procured these Roman Catholic books of controversy, which were certainly so ably put together that many minds might easily be led astray by them. For it must be said that the Roman Catholic or Jesuitical system of argument—the work of the Jesuits from the sixteenth century to the present day—evinces an amount of learning and dexterity, a subtilty of reasoning, a sophistry, a plausibility, combined, of which ordinary Christians have but little idea; and which is well calculated to impose on those minds that are not able to take the trouble to investigate closely the basis of the argument. Those who do so (and the author was one) find that, if tried by the rules of right reasoning, the argument is defective, assuming points which should be proved; that it is logically false, being grounded on sophisms; that it rests in many cases on quotations which are not genuine, and on historic facts which are found to be apocryphal and misrepresented; on passages which when collated with the original are proved to be wholly inefficacious as proofs. When such a system is discovered to be the general characteristic of a system of reasoning, after mature and long inquiry, there is no need to go into further details, or to expose every minute point or difficulty which may be raised. The cause is tried and condemned by the mind without further ceremony. Such was the writer's experience in examining the Roman controversy. He read all that had been written by the Papal advocates. He read the works of Milner, Waterworth, Bossuet, Veron, Bellarmine, Renaudot, and many others. He examined their arguments, he detected their fallacies, and he remained convinced of their errors. One gift he was endowed with: he had patience. He was not convinced at

once by a plausible argument or a striking quotation. He followed them to their sources; he waited for further information on points which he did not understand, and he was rewarded by the simple method of further study; for never did he find a difficulty made or an assertion recorded, which his mere advance in knowledge did not suffice to dissipate into air. He remained at the close more fixed in his faith than at the commencement of the inquiry. His subsequent inquiries have all had the same result. Sometimes perplexed by sophistries, he has never felt inclined to doubt the great truths taught to him, or to accept the Papal argument.

It was this habit of patient investigation which at length induced the author to examine the sources of the English Ritual. In preparing for ordination he needed to ascertain the precise meaning of a certain passage in the Prayer Book, and found himself obliged to refer to the original from which it was translated; Nicholls and Wheatly having made him acquainted with the fact that portions of the Prayer Book were thus translated. Upon searching the Sacramentary of Gregory, which was mentioned as an authority, the author found there many originals of the collects, but much of the Prayer Book was not to be found there. This put the author upon further inquiries, which resulted in his conceiving the idea of his work, "Origines Liturgicæ; or, Antiquities of the English Ritual, with a Dissertation on Primitive Liturgies." This work was commenced in 1826-27, before the author's ordination as a minister of the Church, and was continued to 1828, when he went to reside in Oxford, for the purpose of searching the libraries of that seat of learning. It was intermitted for a time, on finding that the then Bishop of Oxford (whose courtesy he gladly acknowledges) was engaged in the same work. Upon the bishop's premature death, the author was requested by Dr. Burton, the

bishop's successor in the Chair of Divinity, to resume his work, to which the bishop's collections were now added. The author, however, found there but few passages hitherto unknown to him, and these he duly acknowledged in his work, which was printed by the delegates of the Oxford University press in 1832. He considered that the work would be incomplete without a treatise on the Oriental and primitive liturgies, which was accordingly prefixed.

Of this work the author may say that he has sometimes been inclined to regret that his labours tended to fix the attention of Churchmen on the merely antiquarian view of the subject, as if the great subject for rejoicing were the preservation of words hallowed by time and transmitted from the remotest antiquity. And he fears that there have been some who have dwelt with exclusive interest on this lower and more material view of the subject; but he thinks that it admits of a higher interpretation: that it is not merely the words, but the sentiments and principles which those words express, which are thus shown to have descended from Christian antiquity; in short, that the dogma and the worship comprised in the Prayer Book are those which the Church has in all ages professed and taught, and which, when the Reformation was doing its work and all human errors were carefully weeded out from Christian formularies, stood the test, and were approved and sanctioned by the martyrs who laid down their lives for the love of the truth.

The Prayer Book, then, is more than an ancient record of the words which we daily use in our devotions. It is a testimony of our fidelity to the great principles which have descended from the Apostles—a record of our faith never to be forsaken—a guide amidst the perplexities and uncertainties of human opinion. It is a mark of the continuity of faith from the Apostles even to the present day, and therein of the continuance of that Church, which is set

for the preservation and maintenance of the revealed truth. It is amongst the evidences of Christianity, showing that from beginning to end there has been one voice, the voice of the Saviour, announcing the cardinal articles of the Gospel. In the Prayer Book we receive this testimony pure and undiluted, as it issued from the fountain of eternal life, detached from all impure and questionable additions of the worship of creatures, and other errors of the latter days.

I have to apologize for mentioning this work, "Origines Liturgicæ," but in truth it had two effects of some importance. It created a literature on the subject of Liturgiology, which has since attained large dimensions, and given rise to many learned works bearing on a subject which was almost entirely unknown in England until this period. In many of these works, some even which are reputed to be the foremost in the list, there is a lack of critical power, inasmuch as the writers, in treating of ancient and oriental liturgies, make no attempt whatever to discriminate the original text of the liturgies from mediæval and modern additions; and leave the reader to imagine that whatever is read in the modern text was part of the original; which is most inaccurate, and calculated to cause mistakes, and destroys the claim of such texts to be the unadulterated texts of antiquity.

But, in addition, the publication of this work had the effect of introducing the author to the acquaintance of some of the leading spirits who afterwards exercised a decisive influence on the foundation of the Oxford movement of 1833, usually called "Tractarian." He had in this work vindicated the Church of England on what are sometimes called High Church principles, affirming the divine institution of the Church, and its essential independence in creed and jurisdiction of merely temporal powers. He had also argued against the Nonjurors and sustained the harmony

of Church and State. He had vindicated the Reformation. He had defended the catholicity and continuity of the Church in England, and had opposed the pretensions of the See of Rome. No one could mistake his principles, and these principles were felt by the great mass of Churchmen to be in harmony with their own. In forming the acquaintance of Newman and Froude, then very distinguished Fellows of Oriel, and amongst rising men in the University, the author knew that his principles at least were fully known to and approved by these eminent men. Above all he prized the warm approbation which his humble work received from the aged and most learned divine and historian of his time, the venerable Dr. Routh, President of Magdalen College, Oxford, whose friendship he will never forget. But while the author humbly endeavoured thus in his generation to strengthen the outworks of that which he believed to be "the City of God" amongst us, he could not but feel that the cause of God was beset by innumerable dangers. Each day brought forth new symptoms of degeneracy and faithlessness. The spirit of the world had taken such hold on men that the good seed was being choked and overgrown.

Religion was no longer as it had been when England uplifted the standard of Christ to an unbelieving world. It had been enervated by prosperity. Evangelicalism had lost the fervour of its first love. The world had ceased to assail the cross of Christ. Its patronage had been won, and religion began to droop in its embrace. The spirit of worldliness began to invade the Church, while the State, abandoning its care for the interests of religion, was led by new theories of conciliation (which then as ever since proved to be chimerical) to withdraw from the ancient union between Church and State, coeval with the monarchy, and which placed the existing dynasty on the throne, and to extend to error and to schism the same encouragement which

it had so long paid to the heaven-descended truth. And what added to the infliction was the deception by which the opponents of the measure were insulted—the pretence that this great and revolutionary change was introduced in the interests of religion—that the Church would by the betrayal of its interests and the exaltation of its foes become strengthened, and that her victorious opponents would be conciliated.

It was clearly seen by the Church that the loss would be hers, and that there were no counterbalancing advantages. Romanism received the intelligence of the surrender of the British government (the English people happily did not concur) with savage exultation—predicted the speedy death of the Church of England—triumphantly proclaimed the approaching submission of England on its knees before the Pontiff—and looked for the revival of the funeral piles of heretics. Ultramontanism multiplied, was the fruit of emancipation. It is so acknowledged by the Roman Catholic historians of the time.

What had we at this time to oppose to the triumph of the Papacy, and to the fury of political dissent, which in every street issued its proclamations calling on the people to rise and destroy that "black and infernal hag," the Church of England! We had a weak and divided Church. Vain and foolish men had been so far carried away by a sense of their own wisdom and ability to cure all defects and errors, that like masons picking round all the foundations of the Church, they had apparently so shaken the edifice, that there seemed imminent danger to human eyes that the whole fabric would topple over into the dust. They could see evils in the existing system—who could not? But they exaggerated these evils from particular instances to universality—and they proposed remedies which would have produced worse evils than the diseases.

They did not fear to encounter the most important questions in every direction touching on the most essential principles of the Church, not merely in discipline but in doctrine. They were eager to eliminate from the Prayer Book the belief in the Scriptures, the creeds, the atonement, the worship of Christ. They called for the admission of Unitarian infidels as fellow-believers. They would eviscerate the Prayer Book, reduce the Articles to a deistic formulary, abolish all subscriptions or adhesions to formularies, and reduce religion to a state of anarchy and dissolution.

These notions were widely spread. They were advocated in numberless publications, and greedily received by a democratic, thoughtless public, ever, like the Athenians, ready to "hear some new thing." Christianity, as it had existed for eighteen centuries, was unrepresented in this turmoil. In it were included some respected names, which did not go to the lengths of others, but which lent strength to the popular delusion by widespread schemes of alteration.

What might be noticed in all these proposed changes was the spirit of *irreverence* which was widely characteristic of the time, and the want of principle. All who have written on the events of that time, such as Mozley, Newman, Percival, Churton, and others, have noticed the extreme and dangerous unsettlement of opinion about the year 1830, the era when the Reform mania was at its height, and when Reform was decided to be the panacea for every human ill, and was made to supply the defects of Divine Providence.

It was in the midst of this revolutionary turmoil, when the Church and Christianity were in danger of being swept from their old foundations, and replaced upon the philosophic basis of the nineteenth century (which could only have led to desperate quarrels amongst their

members, far exceeding all that had been ever witnessed), that the hand of the Lord was once more put forth, and the Church once more rose to the height of her destiny. Was it to be supposed that Christian faith, even if oppressed for a moment by infidel treason supported by the State, could tamely stand by while the grand cardinal doctrines of Christianity were suppressed? Forbid it, heaven! It would have been the signal for uplifting the banner of Christ once more. The Church and the world would have come into conflict, and conscience would have maintained itself in renewed vigour against the inroads of power.

I have told the tale before of our great danger at this time, 1833, in the *Contemporary Review*, and also in the "Narrative" which is here annexed. It constitutes an essential element in the religious annals of the time, and had results little anticipated; for from this disorganization of thought and action in England sprang the "third Oxford Movement" of 1833, and all it involves of good and evil.

Religion had fallen into the same state of decline which it had often experienced in times past, when Satan had succeeded in corrupting the "salt of the earth," and rendering the "fine gold dim," and taking off the wheels of the chariots, to cause them to drive more slowly. There was no means of offering an effectual resistance to the spreading evil of unsettlement and infidelity. The lines of religion needed to be restored and deepened. Principle had to be infused where there was none to fall back upon. It was in vain to appeal to principles which were not understood. There was no foundation, or an uncertain one, on which to build. The bishops wished well to the truth, but they were in fear of the Government and its powers for good and evil. They were cautious, and did not see their way to any action in opposition to the spirit of the times. So, generally, were

the higher clergy; they were timid; they could see, perhaps, farther than men of humbler station and less wide views. Doubtless the bishops and dignified clergy, in the presence of royalty and of the chiefs of the State, did their best; but they did not possess the attributes of boldness of speech and action which afterwards characterized some of their number. It fell to the inferior clergy to save the Church; and it so pleased God that from the lowest and humblest of His ministers He called forth a few who in the hour of danger were privileged to stand on the Lord's side, and amidst infirmities, failures, fallings away, and shortcomings, to lead the armies of the Lord in the revival of religion and restoration of the spiritual life which had been obscured.

So it was when, in the fourteenth century, the priest of Oxford was impelled to proclaim those truths before which the power of Rome became as nought. So it was when in the sixteenth the obscure and unknown Augustinian friar was raised up to bring new life into the midst of moral corruption; and forthwith "great was the company of the preachers." So it was in the eighteenth, when three obscure men were raised up in Oxford to awaken a nation; to place Christianity on stronger bases than ever; to overwhelm and expel infidelity; to prepare Britain to witness to God at His second coming in the flesh; when Christianity shall stand, while idolatry, superstition, and infidelity will be overtaken by death. And so in our own days God hath visited His people, and out of Sion called to them, and summoned them to be ready, with their loins girded and their lights burning—ready to meet Him and to rise into the air, with prophets, apostles, and martyrs, that they may be with Him for ever.

God's ways are not as our ways, nor God's thoughts as our thoughts. He at the beginning chose the weak things of the world to confound the mighty; He

saved the world, not by man's wisdom, but by the foolishness of preaching. He can make any instruments, however humble, do His work; and if His instruments fail and come to nought, He can send forth fresh labourers into His vineyard. He is our effectual help in time of trouble. It was the effectual purpose of the Lord to revive His own chosen Church; and therefore, amidst the overflowings of ungodliness and the desertion of the world, He caused the seed of faith to germinate and bring forth fresh branches, to the glory of His name and the edification of His chosen. And He permitted the souls of believers to be sorely oppressed and well-nigh driven to despair before He sent relief to their sufferings.

For they beheld the work of God apparently fading before their eyes. Like the prophet they could say, "I have been very jealous for the Lord God of Hosts, for the children of Israel have thrown down Thine altars and cut down Thy groves, and I, even I only, am left, and they seek my life to take it away." But the answer was, "Yet have I left me seven thousand in Israel, even all the knees that have not bowed unto Baal."

And thus might those who were impelled to come forth on the Lord's side in 1833 know that, notwithstanding the indifference or hostility of the world, there was a remnant left which had not shared in the spirit of the age, even a remnant which should speedily swell and grow into a nation, and a Church which should spread and grow mightily like the cedars in Lebanon.

It may be remembered here that the spirit of faith which in 1833 came to replace the spirit of Latitudinarian and Rationalistic or Neologian Infidelity produced one blessed effect. For twenty years it suppressed and terminated the wild and sceptical theories which had preceded it. Their able authors bitterly complained that they could

obtain no hearing. Their lucubrations fell dead from the press. No one read them. The whole world was engaged upon a mightier controversy, which the liberal writers of the day had not entered on—the reality and influence of revealed religion. Those who adopted the extreme views of the liberals and of those who opposed the Tract Movement (in which views some leaders of the Broad Church were deeply implicated) ultimately degenerated into open infidelity, or criticism, as it is called, of which the "Essays and Reviews" (1861) were the first open manifestation. It was only when the Tractarian Movement itself degenerated and lost sight of its original principles, that the spirit of Infidelity and Rationalism took courage to appear upon the scene, and to outrage Christianity by publications which exceed those of any European country in blasphemy and irreligion, under the disguise of philosophic culture and scientific theory.

CHAPTER IV.

ALTERED POSITION OF THE STATE.

It is time to advert to the subject of the Temporal Government of England, on which various remarks have been made in the preceding pages. I shall as a Christian ever regard it as a calamity, both temporally and spiritually, that the governing classes of this country thought it advisable or politically expedient to enter into alliance with the Papal power and its priesthood in Ireland, and thereby with a disaffected population. The results of that alliance seem to me to have been most unfortunate for the country and the Church. We every day see its effects; for what has Ireland been, but an inconvenience to every administration, the usual cause of their disruption? It used not so to be, before the system of conciliating the Papacy and its adherents was commenced. We have not seen the end nor the worst of those evils which are the results. We have yet, I believe, to experience the usurping, intermeddling influence of the Papacy, and to feel the full effect of the anarchical principles which it has secretly fostered, while apparently censuring. We have, I believe, yet to experience the exactions and interferences of a power essentially revolutionary, and which can never be satisfied. But I am well aware that in this matter there are *nulla vestigia retrorsum*. We have to lie down on the bed we have

made for ourselves. It will bring down a Nemesis upon us, but we cannot help it. Doubtless there have been those in power who have acted upon a sense of responsibility, and therefore we cannot presume to judge the motives of statesmen. But this we must say, that when a State deems it requisite to abandon its ancient alliance with Christianity, the least which the Church and the nation can expect is, that the Church may not be incumbered by the State with any restrictions from pursuing freely, like other religious communities, that course which it deems most conducive to the promotion of religion. This is demanded by common equity, and I am glad to say that all parties, except the open and bitter enemies of the Church, the "Liberationists," concur in the principle; and that the State has been in latter years not unwilling to act upon it at times. It is to the pursuance of this policy, the regard to the Church's own feelings, and principles, and wishes, that we look for future benefits to society, though the alliance of Church and State has been for ever broken. And happily the Church is now free to express her own wishes by the restoration of her Convocations, and by the institution of her more informal assemblies, the substitutes for her ancient synods. Why, then, are not her wishes to be attended to in her own affairs, like those of the Roman Catholics, the Presbyterians, and the Dissenters in theirs? Justice, and reason, and policy alike demand it; and hence we have seen the foundation of a few new bishoprics in England; the concurrence in the foundation of new bishoprics in the colonies by the Church authorities; the revival of Convocation; together with the passing of various Acts recommended by the Church authorities for the efficient administration of the Church's revenues and discipline. It would be ungrateful not to remember with satisfaction these and other acts of individual statesmen dictated by

common justice, more especially in selecting for Episcopal promotion men of faithfulness to the communion in which they are called to minister. Hostile acts have been overruled to the welfare of religion, and the hopes of the enemy have been to a great degree disappointed through the Providential care of God for the preservation of religion in His true Church. We have lived to see men appointed to high stations, from whom Infidelity hoped for treason to the great doctrines of Christianity; men from whom the Church dreaded the most dangerous innovations. We have seen the minds of these men so overruled by the Providence of God, that their evil intentions (if such they had) have not taken effect; nay, that in some instances they have become the advocates of truth, and some of the most sincere adherents of the Church. We have unseen Powers watching over us, and bringing to nought the best contrived designs of God's enemies. It is in vain that they work heaven and earth to destroy Christianity. It is in vain that they make the most astonishing exertions, and bring into play all the resources of the most profound cunning and the most fiery zeal. The Lord is against them; and though the Church is weak, yet He interferes, and brings to nought the counsels of the wise; and enables us to bear the temptation.

CHAPTER V.

AWAKENING OF THE CHURCH, 1833.

It was the publication of the "Origines Liturgicæ," as I have said, that first made me acquainted with Newman and Froude, then rising men in the University, and through them with Keble; and also with Hugh James Rose, Christian Advocate at Cambridge, Chaplain to the Primate, and then Editor of the *British Magazine*, through whom I became acquainted with the Hon. Arthur Percival, Rector of East Horsley, late Fellow of All Souls; with Joshua Watson; Mr. Norris of Hackney, heads of the High Church; Edward Churton, and Archdeacon Bayley, and many others, who were not of the Evangelical party. I also knew Buddicom and other Evangelicals, whom I found to be sincere and faithful Churchmen, disposed to charitable and liberal views.

We all contemplated with the deepest alarm the general abuse of principles which led to the inundation of the press by publications recommending the most vital alterations in the Prayer Book and our whole system, merely by the authority of parliament; for the advocates of changes in an infidel direction in the Church of England have always endeavoured to carry their measures by the sole action of the temporal power, being fully aware that the Church will never assent to latitudinarian or infidel innovations. Hence, they have always in our time

invoked the aid of parliament to deprive the Church of her essential doctrines; and this course they had pursued in the present instance, and it was apprehended that we were on the eve of some sudden introduction of a measure into parliament for the appointment of a commission to revise and correct the Prayer-book.

The Reformed Parliament which had just met, and which included very few faithful and avowed members of the Church of England, was presided over by a ministry connected with all that was dangerous in religious principle, zealous friends of Rationalists, Deists, Socinians, Dissenters, and Roman Catholics, all of whom were equally bent on the destruction of the Church. The ministry was too unsettled in principle to inspire any confidence in Churchmen. Faithful Churchmen knew not the moment when some fatal measure might be introduced, perhaps in utter ignorance or indifference; perhaps prompted by some secret hostile influence.

They saw that, judging from the press, the mass of the Liberals were prepared to carry into effect any suggestion of the Liberal Government, even if it amounted to utter subversion of Christian doctrine. They felt their danger to be imminent, and they saw none to help.

Then in that moment of terror and consternation they rose up as one man to defend the cause that was endangered, determined that, cost what it might, and at whatever hazard, they would withstand even to the last; contending for the faith and discipline of the Church of England.

In the first place, as I have said, the really attached friends of the Church became to some extent acquainted. I was in Oxford then, and there I was accidentally brought in contact with Newman and Froude (who, however, very shortly after went abroad on account of Froude's dangerous state of health); but I was in corre-

spondence with Rose and Percival upon the dangers of the times, and I did what I could to resist a dangerous proposal that Unitarians should be treated as members of the Christian community, and invested with all the privileges of Churchmen. I am thankful that the first controversial publication I wrote was in reply to this plan for "calling evil good." I am aware of the undying hatred which the party bore to me in consequence. But what could any individual do to counteract the general dereliction of principle, when many men knew not the grounds of their belief, and were ready to surrender the cardinal doctrines of Christianity and the first principles of Church discipline; Episcopacy itself; the rights of Churches; everything—in sheer ignorance? When there were no principles to fall back upon but those which were antiquated, and were scoffed at as High Church, Nonjuring, &c., if known at all. The notion of the Church as a spiritual body possessing a faith and a conscience, like other religious bodies, had died out. Men in the vain reliance upon a temporal power which had been false to their interests, still sought to borrow their religion from the state, and still indulged in the antiquated theory (once true, but disproved by the State's changes and the growth of nonconformity), that the Church and State were one and the same thing in different aspects.

While I thus earnestly conferred with the other friends of the Church on the prospect of affairs, the autumn and winter of 1832 passed away, but early in 1833 Froude returned to Oxford in better health, and I had once more a friend with whom I could work with entire sympathy in Church questions. For never did I meet with a more cordial response to all that I felt upon these matters or a fuller sympathy. The only point on which I could not concur with him was the manner in which he spoke of

the union of Church and State, which he esteemed unlawful *per se*, while I only objected to its abuses. His language as to the Reformation, too, I could not concur in, having considered with some attention the point as urged in Nonjuring works, and arrived at the conclusion that the Reformation did not merit the unfavourable judgment pronounced.

After some months, in July we were joined by Newman, who had been detained by illness in France, and this greatly strengthened our hands.

In an article in the *Contemporary Review* on the "Oxford Movement," I have ventured on the remark, that "I was not aware of an incident mentioned in 'Froude's Remains,' illustrative at once of the absence of elementary knowledge of the Roman Catholic system, and of the disposition to frame ingenious hypotheses upon the most important practical subjects." The incident referred to I described thus: "Froude had with Newman been anxious to ascertain the terms upon which they could be admitted to communion by the Roman Church, supposing that some dispensation might be granted which would enable them to communicate with Rome without violation of conscience?" and I elsewhere remarked on Newman, "those who conversed with him did not know that while in Italy he had sought, in company with Froude, to ascertain the terms on which they might be admitted to communion with Rome, and had been surprised on learning that an acceptance of the decrees of Trent was a necessary preliminary," and I added, "had I been aware of these circumstances I do not know whether I should have been able to co-operate cordially with him." Nay, if I had supposed him to be willing to forsake the Church of England, I should have said that I could in that case have held no communion with him. As to his knowledge of the Roman Catholic system at that time,

it was not grounded on the critical examination of Roman Catholic works of controversy. It was, I think, superficial at that time and long after. Any one who understood the Roman Catholic system would not have needed to be informed, or surprised to hear, that the reception of the decrees of Trent involved the question of belief in the Infallibility of the Church of Rome, the grand object of the Papacy, the first article in the faith of all Roman Catholics.

The passage on which my remarks were based was in "Froude's Remains" (pp. 304, 307), in which he says: "The only thing I can put my hand on as an acquisition [at Rome] is having become acquainted with a man of some influence at Rome, Monsignor [Wiseman], the head of the [English] college, who has enlightened [Newman] and me on the subject of our relations to the Church of Rome. We got introduced to him to find out whether they would take us in on any terms to which we could twist our consciences, and we found to our dismay that not one step could be gained without swallowing the Council of Trent as a whole."

Mr. Newman, in editing this passage in "Froude's Remains," represents it as merely "a jesting way of stating to a friend what was really the fact, viz. that he and another availed themselves of the opportunity of meeting a learned Romanist to ascertain the ultimate points at issue between the Churches."

Cardinal Newman insists upon it that this is the true version of the affair. I merely ask the reader to compare the two statements—that of Froude made at the time and distinctly, and that of Newman made some years after, to explain it. I ask whether the explanation is not throughout inconsistent with the statement—whether it is not a plain attempt to explain away the statement of Froude—whether Froude's is not evidently the true version.

No doubt Newman thought such explanation quite within his province as editor.

This little piece of *finesse* merits no grave animadversion, and I trust that I have so explained the point adverted to in Dr. Newman's letter, as to relieve me from the imputation of accusing of dishonesty an old friend so much honoured for virtue and honour.

In reference to this subject I will record a conversation which I once had with Cardinal Newman early in the Oxford Movement. It was just as we entered the Turle Oxford from Broad Street, after we had passed by the site of the Martyrs' Memorial, and had crossed over from Balliol College. I spoke of the subscription for the erection of the Martyrs' Memorial then set on foot, and I expressed to Newman my dislike of the tone and spirit of those who were active in it, for I viewed it as a party movement directed against Church principles generally; but of course there could be no objection to such a memorial if rightly advocated. My companion remained silent for a short time, and then, turning to me, put the question to me with great emphasis, almost amounting to agitation: "Whether I thought that there was any real prospect of restoring the communion between the Church of England and the Church of Rome." The speaker's manner showed the intense importance he attached to the question.

I confess that I was perplexed. The union of the Churches was, of course, a subject which had often come before the notice of any thoughtful student, who knew the innumerable attempts from the time of Calixtus downwards to get over difficulties, and the failure of all down to Wake and Dupin. Yet I did not wish to put an absolute extinguisher on what my friend so ardently desired, and which, after all, depends wholly on the inclination of men's hearts, which God alone can rule

and foretell with certainty. I therefore replied that I saw infinite difficulties in the way, nevertheless I would not say it was impossible, but that the true way to promote union was the perfection of the Church in Christian holiness, which would remove present difficulties.

Such was my reply upon the spur of the moment, but on maturer consideration I doubt much whether the growth of the Church of England in Christian holiness would in any degree conciliate her opponents—rather do I fear that it would only add to their hostility. The incident is merely mentioned to show Newman's honest and sincere wish for the reunion of Churches without relinguishing truth, though I believe his idea to have been Utopian; and looking upon it as a mere theory which experience would correct, I never treated the notion as erroneous, or inconsistent with loyalty to the Church of England.

Upon this explanation of an incident the mention of which has been misunderstood by mine ancient friend, and which I trust will not be unacceptable to him, we will return to the subject of the Oxford Movement, in which this distinguished writer took part upon his arrival from France in June, 1833, when he joined us at Oxford, an event which greatly strengthened the hands of those who were now engaged in devising plans for some combination of friends of the Church for the purpose of averting or resisting the threatened attack upon the Church's doctrines and essential characteristics. We had been long terrified by the Reform mania which had invaded every part of the Church, and which threatened to obliterate our creeds and essential tenets; and at the numerous publications urging Unitarian changes in our ritual. And we contemplated, amongst other means of resistance, periodical publications or tracts, conveying sound principles, and telling the world that the great doctrines of the

Church or her essential principles must not be interfered with, and, if interfered with, must be strenuously defended.

Our effort, be it observed, was wholly conservative. It was to maintain things that we believed and had been taught, not to introduce innovations in doctrine and discipline. How far that principle was adhered to, we shall hereafter see. It was always upheld by some, but by others it was in a great degree put aside. Our principle was traditional, the maintenance of that which had always been delivered. It was not philosophical or rationalistic; it was a simple and *bonâ fide* adhesion to the faith we had been taught. I am speaking now of the original foundation on which the movement commenced. Our appeal was to antiquity—to the doctrine which the Fathers and Councils and Church universal had taught from the creeds.

It was at the beginning of 1833 that our fears were verified, though not in the manner which we had anticipated. The attack was not directly made upon the Church in England—some other opportunity was to be reserved for that. It was upon the Church in Ireland—that part of our communion which had been the witness to truth amongst a great Roman Catholic community (now possessed of political power, and returning through the priests a great body of Members of Parliament, through the late proceedings of the Government). The first instalment of the fate awaiting the Church was the suppression of one half of her episcopate by the Government. The bill was advocated by Mr. (afterwards Lord) Stanley, Earl of Derby, who had hitherto been regarded as faithful to the Church of England. The Church itself offered to reduce the income of the threatened sees by one half, so as to provide the 70,000*l.* a year which the Government took away from the Church, (in order to provide for Church rates or cess, which it

abolished on pretence of relieving the Roman Catholics.) The Government's real object was to gratify the priests by the abolition of the hierarchy of the Church of England, as a first step to the entire destruction of the Church's status and property, and the formation of a Roman Catholic establishment; but they did not venture to avow this motive, and pretended that the measure was for the purpose of reforming and strengthening the Church itself.

There were members of the Church of England whose grasp on religious truth and principle was small, who were deceived by such sophistries; but the Church generally saw through them; and to those who were keenly alive to the dangers of the Church, and the evil of dealing with episcopal sees as if they were so many nine-pins to be knocked prostrate for amusement, the shock upon the introduction of this sacrilegious bill was electric. It called them as one man to resist the enactment of laws contrary to the first principles of the Church's discipline, divesting Christians of spiritual privileges not originally bestowed by the State, and which the State could not take away. It was a case in which the Church might have refused to obey, and resisted to prison and to death. It had an effect which was little anticipated. It created the Oxford Movement.

The Church was at once awakened to a sense of its danger. Reaction had set in. Men combined, careless of the result as affected themselves or others. They stood fast, and exerted the utmost of their power, such as it was, to resist such a state of things—such a total abandonment of principle—such a treason to the first principles of the faith—as that amidst which they found themselves. From the introduction of this destructive bill, the whole Church of England well and rightly resisted it in the forms of petition to Parliament and opposition there;

but there were a few who felt more intensely. Amongst them were two, then at Oxford, myself and Richard Hurrell Froude, a Fellow of Oriel, and after some months John Henry Newman, also a Fellow of Oriel. With us were joined Hugh James Rose, Christian Advocate at Cambridge, and the most influential preacher of his time, who was also chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and Arthur Perceval, brother of Lord Arden, and Rector of East Horsley, Surrey, one of the royal chaplains, and who was a learned, devoted and zealous Churchman. Froude and Newman were disciples of Keble, then Professor of Poetry at Oxford, who thoroughly sympathized with us. There might be some small difference of view amongst us. No men are entirely agreed on all points. But those who have been named were thoroughly agreed with regard to the spirit of Latitudinarian and Unitarian reform in our formularies, and against the suppression of bishoprics; and therefore they acted together as brothers, convinced that they were agreed in all essentials. As time went on, however, some points of difference between them made themselves felt.

I must here mention a fact which illustrates Newman's feelings at this time in reference to the suppression of bishoprics. The then Bishop of London offered to Newman the office of Whitehall Preacher at this crisis, but Newman, having learnt that the bishop had not taken a part against the Bill for the suppression of the bishoprics, declined to accept the appointment. The bishop (Doctor Blomfield) was afterwards one of the greatest benefactors of religion, and a bright ornament of the English Church. But Newman acted on the natural impulse of indignation which every true believer felt at so unparalleled an outrage on religion. Those who were thus united in principles and objects had been in frequent correspondence upon the perils of the times, and the intolerable proposal to destroy

the episcopate of Ireland; for we were living in different localities. Newman, Froude, and myself at Oxford, Rose in Essex, Perceval in Surrey, Keble in Gloucester or Hants. It seemed necessary to bring us together for conference upon the course to be adopted. Rose invited us to meet at his house at Hadleigh in Essex, in June, and I accordingly went there, Froude having already arrived, and Perceval came soon after—Newman disappointed us in not being present—and Keble, though expected, did not come. It afterwards appeared that Newman and Keble had no confidence in meetings or committees. We, however, proceeded to discuss fully, for three days, the whole state of things, and the infinite dangers besetting the Church. In this we were all of one mind. But when it came to propose remedies, we could not agree. Each person had his own view of what would be advisable. Rose wished all our publications to appear in the *British Magazine*, of which he was editor; but the proposal seemed to some of us calculated to narrow the usefulness of such publications. In the end, no definite mode of action was agreed on, though all felt the publication of tracts or essays to be an important feature, or rather an imperative necessity. Our meeting stood adjourned to Oxford, where further inquiry was to be made by the parties interested.

CHAPTER VI.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE ASSOCIATION OF FRIENDS OF THE CHURCH, 1833, 1834.

Upon returning to Oxford at the beginning of July, 1833, our conferences upon the condition of things and the remedies to be applied recommenced; and I, being apprehensive that our efforts might come to nothing, from the time expended in discussion and conversation, became anxious that our arrangements should be united and consolidated by a unanimous agreement on the principles and objects we had in view. I accordingly proposed, and the proposal met with unanimous concurrence, as well from my colleagues, Froude and Newman, as from Keble through them, to adopt a declaration embodying the principles and objects of our Association of the Friends of the Church. I accordingly, by their desire, drew up a declaration, which, having been improved by Newman and others, was adopted as the basis of our undertaking. This declaration, entitled, "Suggestions for the formation of an Association of Friends of the Church," commenced by stating the dangers arising from the spirit of innovation which extended to our most sacred doctrines and principles, and in deprecating all change of our vital and essential doctrines, and of our ritual, as threatened, yet left the way open for prudent and well-considered reforms. It concluded with a declaration of our principles and purposes in these terms;—

1. To maintain pure and inviolate the doctrines, the services, and the discipline of the Church—that is, to withstand all change which involves the denial or suppression of doctrine, a departure from primitive practice in religious offices, or innovation upon the Apostolical prerogative, orders and commission of bishops, priests and deacons.

2. To afford Churchmen an opportunity of exchanging their sentiments and co-operating together on a large scale.

Our principle here was Combination of Churchmen agreed upon the great cardinal doctrines of their faith, and untainted by the liberalism and scepticism so widely prevalent, to uphold that which had come down to them from the Apostles—that which they needed not to discover by inquiry—that which in their generation they were bound to attest and maintain. Their course was clear and simple. It was to uphold the Catholic faith once taught; to be loyal to the Church of England and her principles; to oppose the unbelieving Latitudinarian scepticism of the age.

Such was our basis, and as it was of a nature to commend itself to one body and class of men—even the clergy of England—so it may be said that it met their cordial concurrence. They hailed it with joy, as the mere expression of their own sentiments, which, however cast aside by the ceaseless activity of unbelieving writers, remained unshaken, notwithstanding the prevalent fear that false and dangerous doctrines were gaining the ascendency; for the clergy and the devoted friends of the Church did not know the strength of their own position, or calculate upon the national feeling on behalf of revealed truth which existed amidst all the turmoil of infidelity.

At that moment revolutionary principles in religion seemed to be universal. No voice was uplifted on behalf of truth, or if uplifted it was unheard. The press was wholly in favour of revolutionary liberalism in religion; so were the leaders of public opinion—the fashionable pro-

phets of the age. But in our obscure declaration, the true members of the Church recognized their own principles. It obtained universal acceptance. Numbers of Churchmen instantly embracing the declaration with both arms, wrote to us, demanding to be led at once to action on behalf of truth. "What would you have us to do?" was the question generally asked. "If you do not point out our course of action, we shall not know in what direction to turn. The warmth of feeling with which we have received your declaration will lead to no result." In reply to this pressing demand, I suggested to my colleagues in Oxford a proposal which they unanimously approved, that an address should be prepared, directed officially to the Archbishop of Canterbury, as the chief spiritual representative of the Church of England, embodying the sentiments expressed in our declaration, and should be signed by the whole clergy of England—as an unanimous pledge to the world of their resolution to maintain the great principles and the essential discipline of the Church as reformed, against the spirit of revolutionary change then current. I again drew up this address, which was corrected and amended by my colleagues, Newman especially. As yet we knew nothing of Pusey; he was supposed to be favourable to the innovating party; did not join the association; and only became connected with the cause, when Newman had taken the place of leader, and the movement had become Tractarian.

I have elsewhere, in the "Narrative," described our progress and the support which was obtained from the great mass of the clergy throughout England. Though opposed by a few of the bishops at first, who imagined that an address to the Archbishop alone implied some censure upon them, we were enabled to satisfy them that the Archbishop was merely addressed officially as the chief

prelate of the Church of England, not in his personal capacity, and therefore that no peculiar personal merit was ascribed to him.

We then received a cordial support from these prelates, who entirely shared in our principles as stated in the declaration and address. The address, to which the whole clergy were hastening to subscribe, was presented to the Archbishop, at Lambeth, with the utmost formality and publicity we could command, in the beginning of 1834, and caused an encouragement and a rejoicing amongst the faithful members of the Church to which they had been long strangers.

Need I say, they cordially rallied round those humble instruments who had been the means of elevating the Church from despair to hope? It was felt that the machinery now existed for bringing the sentiments and resolutions of the Church of England before the world, so that at least it would not perish unheard, and without the power of resistance. We had learned from the antagonist the secret, "union is strength."

And as union is strength, so is division weakness; and of this truth we had ample experience, for Satan endeavoured to make the effort of the faithful of no effect by the introduction of a principle of division into our cause, and great was the evil thence resulting; but through the exceeding grace and bounty of God, evil was overcome of good, and in the long struggle truth and right came forth triumphant, and the principles of our association were established. I have mentioned in the "Narrative," some events which will be noticed presently namely, that the address to the Archbishop of Canterbury was immediately succeeded by an address to him from the laity of England, re-echoing the sentiments expressed in that of the clergy. This address arose from the touching appeal made to us by members of the laity in all parts,

who were anxious to be associated with their clergy in the expression of loyalty to the Church of England and her principles. It was drawn up, I think, chiefly by Joshua Watson, Treasurer of the Christian Knowledge Society, and the most influential of the lay Churchmen of his time, and was signed by hundreds of thousands of heads of families. They might have been millions, if the committee had not felt anxious to restrict overwhelming multitudes from joining.

The Church of England at once rose from her deep depression, and found, to her astonishment, that the nation was unanimous in devotion to the old and established faith and worship—that it was of the same creed which for nearly four centuries had placed England at the head of the reformed and believing Christianity of the world.

During the circulation of the lay address, the newspapers daily recorded the expression of sentiments by the Churchmen of England, assembled in meetings which were convened in every town to adopt the address; and noble indeed was the spectacle of a nation boldly, and yet with Christian feeling, declaring its unalterable devotion to the unaltered religion which it had inherited from past times, and was resolved at all hazards still to maintain pure and unchanged in its great features. I may add that, shortly after, the king himself, William IV., in reply to an address from the bishops of the Church of England on his birthday in May, 1834, solemnly declared, in the presence of God, his attachment to the Church from the deepest conviction, and his fixed purpose, determination and resolve, to maintain the religion of the country and the Church of England and Ireland. The king was seen to be deeply affected as he spoke, and thus declared his unalterable adhesion to the religion of the Church of England. This address will be found in the "Narrative." Nor was this all; the leaders

of opposite political parties in Parliament took occasion shortly after to declare in Parliament their attachment to the Church of England, and their resolution to maintain her rights; and from that moment, during a long course of years, ministry after ministry vied with one another in measures favourable to the extension of the Church of England, and conducive to her welfare. It was only when the Church of England became divided by strong party contests, that the revolutionary and dissenting party took courage to renew their schemes of infidel alteration, and of the plunder of the Church. While the Church was united on common principles, all the weapons of her enemies fell scatheless to the ground.

I look back upon these manifestations of a principle unscientific it may be, but nevertheless deep-set and real—and ask whence except in the assertion of a rooted faith, a conviction which needed no vain infallibility or delusive speculation, could so great an outburst of truly national feeling have arisen? I look back with comfort to remember that with that great and salutary movement I was humbly associated.

CHAPTER VII.

THE TRACTARIAN MOVEMENT.

But we have now to enter upon another phase of that revival on which we have been hitherto commenting—the part which at this crisis suddenly found itself Tractarian, that is to say, informed, guided, and presided over by Newman alone.

While actively engaged in London and in many parts of England as deputed from our friends in Oxford, I learnt that a series of tracts had been put in circulation from Oxford. Upon the interruption of our conferences in August, Newman had, as he informs us in the "Apologia," commenced the composition and circulation of the "Tracts for the Times," dealing with the various evils of the day, and applying Church principles so as to meet the existing Latitudinarian and infidel theories and systems then so widely prevalent. The object was one which was grateful to all true Churchmen and believers. It had formed the subject of our deliberations at Hadleigh and in Oxford, but we had not been able to arrange any settled plan of conjoint publication, seeing the difficulty of securing uniformity of statement and opinion, and many other obstacles. Still we did not relinquish the hope of seeing such publication. In August, however, Newman being left in Oxford without support except from Froude (which speedily ceased on the latter again going abroad), and

being aided by letters from Keble, who shared his opinions on Church matters, resolved to cut the knot, and himself to publish a series of tracts dealing shortly with all the great questions discussed at that time. He did so without consulting others; and issued a number of tracts at once, which he caused to be circulated by all our friends with the utmost diligence.

Now to this step no objection whatever could have been taken, had the tracts been understood to be the compositions of Newman alone. He, as well as others, might have published a series of tracts in his own name, and no one would have felt responsible but himself. But unfortunately we had become public characters, and our names belonged not merely to ourselves but to others. The Oxford clergy were marked men, exercising great influence over others. They were united in an association, and that association had principles. If therefore a series of tracts proceeded from that association, the effect was very serious. Now unfortunately Newman published the "Tracts for the Times" anonymously. He withheld his name. The consequence was that they became invested with the character of tracts of the whole association. They were everywhere called, not Newman's Tracts, but the "Oxford Tracts." Thus the whole association became responsible for their contents. They were supposed to be the results of united councils, whereas they were really the expression of Newman's opinions and of those friends and disciples whom he chose to associate with him in his tracts. I readily admit that much of the contents of these tracts was simply what I and all true Churchmen should have professed and advocated. Their clearness and simplicity and popular character were undeniable, but it was a result of their origin that in dealing with subjects which required attentive handling, and a full knowledge of the systems advanced by Romanism and by Dissent, assertions should be sometimes

made, which, though they were not actually Romish or Dissenting, might easily be mistaken for such. At the time Newman and Froude, as we have already said, were not intimate with the Roman controversy, and did not know the advantage taken by its writers of chance expressions, or admissions; or of the advantage which Dissenters took of the incautious language of Nonjurors to raise jealousy against the Church of England.

No one can doubt that Newman's motives were most excellent. His desire was to counteract the spirit of Latitudinarianism and Rationalism then prevalent, and against which we all equally protested. Nor can any one dispute his right to publish tracts. But they should have borne his name, so as not to compromise others. In adopting a different course he at once constituted himself an independent head, and a leader of a new movement; for the tracts were assailed as representing the whole movement, and they became at once its official organ before the world, and no explanation could remove this impression. Therefore, as the editor of the Tracts, Newman at once became head of a new form of the movement, and imposed on it its theological character; and those who did not adopt his opinions and recommendations in all points, but even objected to some of them, had no alternative left, except by open protest, which they were prevented from doing by friendship, and by the great truths which were held in common, then violently assailed in combination with the Tracts; or else by submitting to the imputation of opinions which every day became more distasteful to them from their gradual approximation to Romanism, issuing in a few years in the fall of Newman himself and his disciples. It was also a principle with Newman, and in this he was supported by Froude and partly by Keble, that the Tracts should be written by individuals on their own responsibility—that they should

be absolutely unchecked in their expression of theological opinions—that the Tracts, the organs of Oxford opinion, should be wholly unrevised—that any revision would necessarily destroy all the interest, force, and individuality of such publications—that they would degenerate into formal and orthodox and unreadable expositions of religion. The principle, then, was established in the Tractarian Movement, that individual judgment was to exercise the fullest influence upon these and other publications, and when individual judgment was so strongly encouraged, it was impossible in the nature of things that private opinions and speculations should not be introduced. Thus a movement which had been introduced as that which was to lead to unity, and was based on adherence to the known truth taught by the Church of England, was gradually changing its form, and while theoretically advocating established principles and resisting innovations, was introducing as an essential principle the most unbounded freedom of speculation, provided it was not in the direction of Latitudinarianism. The natural result followed. After a time this system encouraged freedom of speculation in another direction—Rome.

This tendency was speedily perceived by the Evangelical party, and their language was most vehement on the subject. Relying, as I and most other Churchmen did, on the honour and integrity of Newman and his associates, and aware that they were in many points maintaining the truth against its impugners, we did not openly oppose the progress of Newman's opinions, though we could not concur with many of his positions, or those of his immediate disciples, such as Ward, Oakeley, Wilberforce (Robert), and others.

But it was undeniable that Newman and his friends, notwithstanding their frequent efforts to deny the imputation of secret Romanism which was continually urged

on them, did sometimes lay down principles which were either Romish, or approximated to Rome; and which were not to be defended. Nevertheless, supposing that these arose from ignorance or incaution, it never occurred to the writer or others as possible that one who had been made acquainted with the truth, and had laboured for the correction of anomalies in the Church of England and for the removal of defects in her system—who in fact had played the part of the leading reformer and improver of the Church of England—could after all fall into the abyss of faithlessness towards her position and her mission. The author ridiculed the idea. From all his intercourse with Newman and the works of that writer, he could have staked his veracity on the stability of that eminent man.

I may here mention what may seem at first sight inconsistent with the above statement. Notwithstanding the independent course which I continued to pursue as a member of the Church of England, I was on one occasion connected with the publication of the "Tracts for the Times" in the following way. I refer to Tract XV., "On the Apostolical Succession in the English Church."

Newman (it was early in the publication of the Tracts) was urgent with me to contribute a Tract to the series. It was to be on any subject I pleased, and to be treated as I liked it. I am, however, not prompt in the composition of tracts. The ability to write them is not in my possession, and consequently the request long remained unattended to. At length, in compliance with Newman's renewed requests, I put together some remarks on the Apostolical succession of the episcopate in the English Church; but I was so much dissatisfied with their dulness, that I was on the point of committing them to the flames. But at that moment happening to meet Newman near Exeter College, he again pressed me earnestly to

contribute one of the Tracts, and not knowing how to escape, I was obliged to confess that I had written something on the subject, but did not consider it deserving of publication, and could not finish it. Newman insisted so earnestly on having it, that I was obliged to consent; at the same time disclaiming all responsibility; for he undertook to revise and complete the Tract.

Upon examining the Tract as inserted by him in the series, I can see nothing of importance to which I do not subscribe even now. It is simply an argument on behalf of the Apostolic succession in the Church of England, and I do not discover Newman's handiwork anywhere. I have no reason to be disturbed by the principles there advocated; but they were displeasing to Froude and Keble, who reproached Newman for admitting such conservative principles into the series, and considered it to be a species of *οἰκονομία*, intended to meet the popular taste for safe principles.

For a long time the Tractarian Movement under Newman proceeded with uninterrupted success. Pusey had in 1834 become a disciple and a bosom friend of Newman. His high religious character, his learning, and the station which he occupied in the University as Professor of Hebrew, together with his aristocratic connexion with the Earls of Radnor, rendered him an acquisition of the highest value to the Tractarian party, which about this time became highly organized, and the members of which moved in a phalanx, as one man. Whatever was put forward by any leader, was defended as an article of faith; and those who did not go to all lengths with them were stigmatized as time-servers, Erastians, Conservatives, incapable of comprehending ideas, shallow and undiscerning men, &c. Oxford furnished plenty of men who were highly educated, but whose ideas were derived merely from party-leaders whom they revered as all but inspired.

To talk of differing from any of their leaders was a species of blasphemy; and those who exercised any independent judgment felt themselves excommunicated by a great part of the community.

Nevertheless, the complete organization of the party and the great amount of truth which underlay their system produced great and permanent results in society. One of its benefits was the interest which it excited in the young in all religious practices and exercises. If it sometimes urged daily service in vain, it nevertheless promoted religious exercises and seriousness of character, and a keen interest on many religious questions which had been matters of indifference. Its influence over the higher classes was very remarkable. It was essentially an aristocratic movement, addressing itself to the higher and more educated classes through the medium of the intellect. Unlike Wesleyanism, it did not engage in the work of preaching to the poor and converting to religion those who were living without God in the world; but, by reasoning and written appeals to the conscience, it reached those classes who were beyond the reach of practical preaching. At the same time it was fruitful in good works. It promoted the great work of restoring and building churches, and the work has been carried out in England with unexampled zeal. Thousands of churches owe their repair and their existence to the Tractarian Movement. This is a point which should not be forgotten among the benefits resulting from that movement.

Statesmen, nobles, valiant friends of the Church, who have ever since nobly assisted in all good works, who at this moment constitute the great strength of that Church, owe their religious impressions and principles to that great movement which has so many claims on our gratitude. Had this good work not been interrupted,

it would have had still more wonderful effects, notwithstanding all the opposition offered to it. We should have been proud of it, if it had not deviated from its original principles. Every objection would have been carried away, if it had but been faithful to its original principles and persevering in their inculcation.

The Tractarian Movement derived force and union from being wholly under the direction of one head—Newman—of whose high abilities, earnest piety, and marvellous powers of conciliation I have spoken elsewhere more fully (*Contemporary Review*, May, 1883). No one could resist the charm of his manner and the beauty of his intellect, and even to the present day his early Parochial Sermons are universally admired. He had all the qualities which are needed to constitute a great religious leader or the founder of a sect. He at once became a great leader of opinion in an organized community, which acted together as one man. Everything was done to secure the joint action of the whole. The society was as completely organized as a political party in Parliament.

To revert for a moment to the author's own position. He, upon the failure of the endeavours made in vain to secure some supervision of the Tracts, or to discontinue them as authorized, withdrew from taking any active part, and therefore very rarely met Newman. He returned to studies which had been too long interrupted, and commenced a work, a "Treatise on the Church of Christ," which was intended to be a theological exposition of the facts on which Church principles rest, and a defence against Romanism and Rationalism. This work occupied his time for four years, when, in 1838, it was published. In 1836 the Hampden controversy took place, in which he was deeply interested against Hampden, whose Bampton Lectures tended to the overthrow and disbelief of the

whole doctrinal system of the Church of England. Of this controversy I have treated at length in the "Narrative" here reprinted.

I have to mention one other circumstance, which is of a private nature, but which, bearing as it does on what are now the permanent discipline and institutions of the Church of England, is perhaps deserving of notice. I refer to the institution of "Honorary Canonries," which are conferred by the bishops upon the most deserving and distinguished clergy of their dioceses, and which, while entirely divested of pecuniary advantage, are among the prized rewards of ministerial diligence. The number of clergy who have been thus distinguished, and who have afterwards ascended to the larger and more responsible duties of the episcopal office, is not inconsiderable. I will state, then, the circumstances under which these offices of honorary canons came into existence.

The Government was at that time friendly; and, in co-operation with the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Howley) and the episcopate, brought forward the Reform Bill for the Church of England, providing for Church extension on the principle of taking from benefices of deans, chapters, and dignitaries, upon vacancy, funds which had long been treated as sinecure, and applying these funds to relieve the spiritual wants of the millions of Churchmen who had grown up suddenly in the manufacturing districts of the country, and were destitute of teachers. It was a gigantic plan of Church extension. Looking at the substance and essence of religion in preference to its adjuncts, it seemed impossible to avoid thankfulness for a plan which for the first time made provision, however inadequately, for the prodigious spiritual destitution of the English people; for their preservation in Christianity, and all that it involves.

But in so vast a design it was unavoidable that many interests, idcas, and principles should be affected. It was easy to overlook the greater good which was the ultimate end, in the contemplation of minor but more immediate inconveniences. Amongst the strongest pleas adduced at the time against the abolition of sinecures, or offices which had long been practically sinecure, was the argument that by the suppression or suspension of such offices the provision for a learned clergy expending their time in the composition of works of theology, would be fatally impaired. Dr. Pusey had published a work on cathedral institutions, in which he strongly resisted the suppression of cathedral offices, which he wished to make effective. Mr. Manning was eloquent in the same cause. They did not consider that in fact those offices never had been ordinarily given to learned men, and that they had from time immemorial been sinecure.

The Archbishop and prelates were hard pressed by arguments in Parliament against the ruin of the provision for a learned clergy, and still more of the power of rewarding distinguished clergy by their appointment to poor but dignified offices, such as those of prebendaries, and dignitaries in the cathedrals.

Had this opposition succeeded, the funds for Church extension would have been vastly reduced, for these benefices, though their estates were usually let at nominal rents, returned, upon the renewal of leases, at the fall of lives, great sums of money as renewal fines. Sometimes a fine amounting to 20,000*l.* or 30,000*l.* would be paid; and the estates of one prebendal stall in London were computed to be likely to return, when out of lease, 100,000*l.* per annum.

The author was one of those who were strongly in favour of the principle and objects of the Bill. He could not think that the maintenance of a learned clergy was

the primary object of the Church, and was contented to leave that desirable object to the providence of God and the call of necessity.

The Archbishop, on the other hand, and the advocates of the measure, were severely pressed by the leaders of the High Church party to abandon great part of the scheme, and the Archbishop did not seem well able to answer their arguments.

The author, then, being convinced that the opposition to the measure was grounded on a narrow view and an imperfect conception of facts, and that prebendaries and sinecurists had never been remarkable for learning; and feeling that the opposition was thus unreal, ventured to write direct to the Archbishop of Canterbury, suggesting to his Grace that, under the circumstances, if the opponents of the measure insisted that the bishops under the Bill would no longer have the power of marking their sense of distinguished clerical services by honorary offices and distinctions, such as the sinecure prebendal stalls and dignities, that object might be attained consistently with the suppression of sinecures, by creating honorary canonries in each cathedral, to which the bishops should appoint, and which, being merely honorary and unendowed, would precisely meet the demands of the opponents of the Bill. The author explained that this was the course adopted by Napoleon I. on the reconstruction of the Gallican Church in 1801, when he constituted honorary canons in every cathedral, whom the bishop might appoint in unlimited numbers.

The author was surprised to receive an answer from the Archbishop by the next post, directing him to send up at once all particulars of the plan, with all the documents and books which he quoted to establish the matter of fact. He thereupon sent up his books and authorities, and also a sketch of several clauses embody-

ing the plan, for insertion in the Act of Parliament. The clauses were in a few days accordingly inserted by Parliament with scarcely any change, all opposition having ceased upon their introduction; and a compromise was come to with the opponents, by which they consented to retain the sinecure offices, without their estates; and hence the unendowed offices of prebendaries and dignitaries in some cathedrals, while in others the honorary canons are established as above stated.

The author included in the clauses a provision that the number of honorary canons should not be indefinite, as in France; that they should be twenty-four in each cathedral, and that only two should be appointed in each year. He was informed some years after by the secretary of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, whom he accidentally met at the Bishop of London's, that the records of the whole affair, including his correspondence, were preserved in the records of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

CHAPTER VIII.

CHANGE IN THE ATTITUDE OF TRACTARIANISM.

For six years the Tractarian movement under the headship of Newman and Pusey continued its bold and impetuous, yet, on the whole, successful course amidst the violent opposition of Dissenters, ultra-liberal Protestants, and Unbelievers. Their principle was to offer no reply to the numberless attacks made on them, but to trust to the strength of their principles and the internal force of truth, to gain the advantage over their opponents. Perhaps some of them were ashamed to announce that such principles as they had to oppose could be put forward by professing members of the Church. Some pugnacious spirits were vehemently angry at their silence. They would have preferred to dispute the question, and air their own opinions, which remained unheard through the policy of abstention and silence. To an independent looker-on, not unfriendly to the Tractarians, it was evident that they were gaining upon their antagonists, in spite of the occasional mistakes which they committed.

They were at last tempted to break silence after six years' endurance, during which they had been subjected to charges of every kind, chiefly founded on their alleged inclination to Romanism, and consequent disloyalty to the Church of England, of which they were ministers. In 1839, then, at length, appeared a formal defence of

Tractarianism against its numerous opponents. The task was committed to Pusey, the bosom friend and *alter ego* of Newman, and who might be considered the second head of the Tractarian Association. His work, "A Letter to the Bishop of Oxford," was most elaborately written, with references to all the leading works assailing the system. It was formally addressed to the bishop of the diocese, with the fullest recognition of his authority as a successor of the apostles. This recognition of the apostolical character of our episcopate had been the fundamental principle of the whole movement. It had been the principle of the Association of the Friends of the Church and all its members, upon which they undertook to oppose the Latitudinarian and infidel systems of the day. It was here still confessed by Tractarianism, and put in the front of its defence. By Pusey's letter the whole Tractarian body adhered anew to the apostolicity of the Christian episcopate and ministry in England. Pusey, therefore, and the body represented by him, firmly believed that the Church of England was apostolical, and possessed of a divinely-commissioned ministry. This principle was unhappily soon to be departed from by a part of the Tractarians.

Pusey put forth his work for the purpose of clearing the advocates of Tractarianism from the imputation of holding corrupt and dangerous principles approximating to Romanism. He admitted no such fault in the system as generally put forth. He did not distinguish between the opinions of individuals and the doctrine taught by the society at large, but vindicated the whole system which had been taught; and certainly with great success, as far as the argument went. His work was regarded as a master-piece, a triumphant vindication of the whole Tractarian system.

But Pusey in writing this book had forgotten that

the first principle of Newman, Froude, and Keble, had been that, provided Latitudinarian infidelity were rejected, individual Churchmen might exercise the most unbounded liberty in the expression of their opinions. No one was to check or restrain the freest expression of views. The principle of unrestrained liberty is apt to degenerate into licence, and to the overthrow of authority and unity in belief; yet those who advocated it were continually asserting the principle of Church authority and traditional religion, which could of course be taken in different senses by individuals. Those, then, who happened to have received some inclination in favour of Roman doctrine, being unchecked and unrestrained, they soon came to regard the Roman tradition as that which should overrule and correct the English. Others adhered more to the Church of England, and were opposed to Rome. Pusey did not recognize this difference. The truth appears to be that at this time there were two parties among the Tractarians, though not in open opposition—those who inclined to Rome, as Newman, Ward, Oakeley, and Robert Wilberforce; and those who inclined from Rome, as Pusey himself, and the great body of his adherents.

Pusey's work then undertook the defence of Tractarianism generally from all the attacks made on it from 1833 to 1839. He vindicated the authority of Scripture, and that of the Church, maintaining the sound and orthodox view of the weight of universal tradition. He excused the doctrines on justification derived from Bishop Bull. He explained the doctrine he had taught on sin after baptism, which had been greatly condemned. He quoted the language of the Fathers in excuse for that employed about the sacraments; vindicated prayers for the departed from the imputation of belief in purgatory; and the invocation of saints from the imputation of

idolatry; and defended opinions in favour of celibacy, not as meritorious, but as salutary in certain cases.

On the whole his vindication was substantially accepted as successful, and strengthened the Tractarian cause; but the most important of its characteristics was that it plainly showed the faith of the Tractarian party in the Church of England; its sincere and honest adhesion to the grand principles in which the whole movement had originated; fidelity to the Church of England; firm belief in her divine doctrine and creeds, and in her apostolical ministry. Such were the principles of the Tractarian body, evinced in a thousand ways. But we have now unhappily to open a new page in the history of Tractarianism. At the beginning of 1839 I became aware, by information from several quarters, that there was a most dangerous doctrine spreading amongst Newman's disciples in the university; in short that they accepted the doctrines which had been put forth by the Roman Catholics in the *Dublin Review*, by which our ordinations were alleged to be invalid, and to confer no jurisdiction; and our priesthood to be therefore unordained. I found that many of the leading disciples of Newman were convinced of the truth of these ideas. It was not known what Newman himself thought on the subject. The articles were written by Cardinal Wiseman, at that time editor of the *Dublin Review*. The argument was to a certain degree new; but I wondered greatly that any one could be influenced by it, knowing the innumerable attempts made by Rome in this direction, and the utter overthrow which they had all experienced.

However, as these articles took new ground, and were widely believed by the Tractarians, I felt it necessary to answer them, and accordingly in the course of the summer published "The Apostolical Jurisdiction of the Episcopacy in the British Churches, vindicated against

the Objections of Dr. Wiseman in the *Dublin Review.*" The work answered all the objections made against the orders and jurisdiction of our episcopate. Dr. Wiseman did not return any answer to this defence. His argument also rested entirely on the Gallican view, as opposed to the Ultramontane. The answer to Wiseman was unanswered, and it effectually disposed of the Roman Catholic argument against the regularity of our orders. I had reason to believe that it completely answered its purpose, and I heard no more of the objections which had been raised against the English orders. The danger seemed to have passed away.

I have already alluded to Newman in connexion with this subject. What he thought was not known; but any one who considered the matter attentively could see that such a notion could not have become widely spread amongst Newman's disciples if it had not been approved by Newman himself. I cannot help connecting this with the doubts which beset his disciples regarding the validity of our ordinations. And what greater cause of uneasiness could fall on professing members of the Church of England, and persons who claimed to be the most earnest of her supporters, than to find that the whole basis on which they depended was false and unreal?

The whole case shows that in the spring of 1839 the faith of Newman's disciples had received a severe shock; that they ceased to believe firmly in the Apostolical Succession in the Church of England; that though they may momentarily have recovered, they probably never again believed firmly in the Church of England—that they were thenceforth open to the temptations and the sophistries of the author of evil. It has been observed that this disturbance of the faith of Newman and his disciples appears to have taken place in the spring of 1839, when I found that doubts were

rife in Oxford among the Tractarian party; but that I was enabled to reply to Wiseman's arguments in the course of the spring and early summer. Soon after this the faith in the apostolic succession was restored—Newman being reassured on the subject of the English ordinations, and having given up Wiseman's notions. This would harmonize exactly with the date of the publication of Dr. Pusey's letter to the Bishop of Oxford, which was on St. Matthias' day, 1839, or the end of February; and probably, therefore, before Newman had been influenced by Dr. Wiseman's objections. Thus he and his disciples might cordially join in the confession of the apostolic character of the Church of England, with which Pusey's tract abounded, and yet in the same year become full of doubts as to the apostolical character of the English Church.

From the moment, however, of the introduction of these Romish views of the Church of England into the university, and the circulation of Roman Catholic books which followed as the consequence—in fact, from the moment that Tractarianism admitted an element alien to its original views, and hostile to the Church of England, and disbelieved that Church's divine institution—from that moment a new feature presented itself in the history of Tractarianism. Newman was the editor of the *British Critic*, at that time regarded as the literary organ of the Church of England, and which exercised a great influence over the clergy. Newman had for some time sought to obtain influence there, in order to inculcate his views more widely, and had at length obtained the entire control over that important periodical. To say that it was written with singular ability would be superfluous. Dr. Newman could not write otherwise than brilliantly and well: but unfortunately the views inculcated there were such as caused deep

uneasiness in all true and faithful members of the Church.

From 1841 commenced a series of articles in the *British Critic*, contributed chiefly by Ward and Oakeley, Fellows of Balliol, and the most fervent amongst Newman's immediate *clientèle*. Ward was a man of considerable talent, and of immense fluency, and was chiefly remarkable for his taste for metaphysics and philosophy, upon which his theories were endless, and of the most daring description. By Newman's principle this audacious intellect was set free to deal with religion in the Tracts and *British Critic* according to the bent of its genius. Ward and Oakeley had no doubt been amongst the number of those whom Wiseman's articles against the English ordinations had deeply affected. They were consequently open to the sophistries which were abundantly supplied to them in Romish books, and which Churchmen had no means of counteracting, because they were read in secret, and were not known to Churchmen. The effect was that the *British Critic* put forward principles by degrees which were of so evidently a Romish complexion, that it was vain to attempt to deny the fact. At this crisis, too, occurred an incident which is remarkable in the history of the movement, and precipitated that secession which had long been predicted, but which I, for one, could not conceive to be within the verge of possibility, deeming it impossible that a man of Newman's intellectual power, and who had for so many years openly and, I am convinced, sincerely stated his hostility to Popery, would actually fall into its toils.

The publication of Tract 90, in which all the articles were interpreted in a Roman Catholic sense, and a claim was made to hold them in that sense, created, of course, immense sensation in the religious world. Demands were immediately made for the excommunication of the

author of the Tract, proceeding from all quarters of the compass. I was taken by surprise; but believing that Newman was still faithful to his principles, and that the Tract was merely intended to keep in the Church parties who were on the point of seceding; and judging that a large part of the opposition proceeded from men who sought to destroy that which was regarded as most essential in doctrine and discipline, and influenced by old friendship, I threw in my name as amongst those who protested against any punishment being inflicted. I did so in common with Dr. Hook and Perceval, whom Newman has described as "gallantly" coming to his aid.

In the midst of violent excitement upon the publication of Newman's Tract 90, he agreed to the wish of the Bishop of Oxford, that the publication of the "Tracts for the Times" should cease, and apparently submitted to the storm; but at this crisis another antagonist appeared on the scene. The Church of Rome put forward her claims to the adhesion of Newman and his adherents. Dr. Wiseman, the Coryphæus of the Roman cause, the same whom Newman and Froude had consulted at Rome upon the feasibility of being received as English Churchmen into the Papal communion, retaining their doctrines, had seen through the Catholic tendencies of these English clergymen, and the theoretical and imperfect information which they possessed. It was on such minds that Jesuitical sophistry might be expected to work. Here were minds at once religious, enthusiastic, uninformed, theoretical, and bold in conclusion and action. The Church of Rome never loses a clue of this kind. Wiseman saw that there was an opening for the circulation of that false and plausible reasoning of Jesuitism in which he was an adept; skilful to put a plausible face upon the worst corruptions, and to instil doubt where there was no real doubt. He was instantly

despatched to England as Vicar Apostolic, to follow up the clue thus presented to him. He forthwith set on foot the *Dublin Review* as a means for reaching the class of minds at Oxford with which he had come in contact. As already observed, he had applied himself in the first instance in a series of articles to shake belief in the apostolical commission of the English clergy. He knew that Newman, and Froude, and their partisans, and the Church generally, built their cause upon the belief in the apostolical commission of the English clergy. Therefore, to destroy that belief was to break down the whole system. I had in 1839, as already stated, demonstrated the nullity of Monsignor Wiseman's arguments, and he had not attempted to defend them.

In 1842, on the occasion of the publication of Tract 90, Newman, in a letter to Dr. Jelf, had defended his exposition of the Articles, stating that they do not formally condemn certain Romish practices, since they were composed before the formal enactments of the Council of Trent on those subjects; but he added that "the present authoritative teaching of the Church of Rome, to judge by what we see of it in public, I think, goes very far indeed to substitute another Gospel for the true one. Instead of setting before the soul the Holy Trinity and heaven and hell, it does seem to me as a popular system to preach the blessed Virgin, and the Saints, and purgatory. If there be an erroneous system which requires reformation, it is Rome at this day, or in other words (as I should call it), Romanism or Popery." He explains his principles further, thus:—

"In the Roman schools we find St. Mary and the Saints the prominent objects of regard and dispensers of mercy, purgatory or indulgences the means of obtaining it, the popes the rulers and teachers of the Church, and miracles the warrant of doctrines."

Monsignor Wiseman thereupon declared, that the Council of Trent represented the only authoritative teaching of the Roman Church, and that there was no other (the infallibility of the Pope without council being then unrecognized as the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church). Hence, as the worship of the Virgin, and setting up of purgatory in place of heaven and hell, were not decreed by a pope in a general council, viz. by Trent, they could not be imputed to the Church of Rome; and he denied that they are the doctrines of the Roman schools, put forward plausible explanations of the practices and doctrines, pretended that they are mere abuses, and explained them away.

Upon the appearance of this letter, by which the Church of Rome hoped to gain attention to her claims from the party so hardly pressed in Oxford, and which had already showed such signs of impressibility, I felt that Wiseman's appeal, in the critical aspect of affairs, needed a firm and an immediate reply. I therefore spoke to Newman and ascertained from him that he had no intention of writing in answer to Wiseman's formal appeal; and on the instant I resolved to publish an answer to the latter in vindication of the sentiments against Rome which Newman had just expressed in his letter to Jelf. Those sentiments at that crisis entirely confirmed me in the belief that Newman was essentially a member of the Church of England, and adhered to her cause against the Church of Rome. I could easily account for his silence in respect to Wiseman, in consequence of his recent labours.

My reply appeared in a few days. It was directed to show that the worship of the Virgin and the other errors of the Church of Rome characterized by Newman, although not included in the decrees of Trent, were formally authorized by the Pope, and binding on Roman

Catholics; and consequently that the Church of Rome was responsible for them. Wiseman rejoined by the publication of a letter to me, in which he lamented that my want of knowledge of Christian antiquity had blinded me to the fact that language of worship had been addressed to the Saints from the earliest ages of the Church even stronger than any I had quoted, and therefore that the Church of Rome simply followed the example of Christian antiquity in its adoration of the Virgin and Saints. His reply was apparently so crushing and triumphant, that many of the opponents of Rome thought that I was completely extinguished as a disputant, and that Wiseman was triumphant in his reply. But that was not my opinion. I had had sufficient experience from an early age that Roman quotations cannot be trusted, and that they need a very close examination. I had also already tested Wiseman's power as a controversialist. I therefore examined Dr. Wiseman's quotations from the alleged early fathers, and, strange to say, I found that great masses of them, including all that were of real importance, were translated from spurious and fabricated works, which even the first critics of the Church of Rome have rejected as falsely ascribed to the authors whose names they bear. Having completed this examination, I added extracts from the genuine works of the Fathers, which directly forbade any such worship to be paid to creatures, including the Virgin; and I then published the whole in a few days.

When this publication appeared, the tables were turned. It was seen at once that Wiseman was utterly overthrown. The charge of forgery and falsification was damning and undeniable. Neither Wiseman himself nor any one for him attempted any reply. The Roman Catholic party were silent. They could not answer; and in such cases they always preserve silence, and trust that amidst

the current of events unpleasant facts will be forgotten. Wiseman was silenced, and I proceeded in a series of pamphlets to expose the sophistry of his lectures on the Catholic Church, without meeting any antagonist.

Having thus vindicated the language used by Newman, and come forward on his behalf, I had later, an interview with him, and brought before him the language adopted in the *British Critic*, which had latterly become most painful to Churchmen, abounding in what was unfavourable to the Church of England, and favourable to that of Rome. I pressed upon him the great offence which such things had given, and urged him to use his influence as editor to suppress such teaching in future.

Newman replied under evident excitement, and in a spirit which was new to me. He said that he was no longer editor of the *British Critic;* that it had passed under different control; that the heads of the Church had thought fit to condemn him and to destroy his usefulness; that they had silenced him, and that they would now have to deal with younger men, whom it was not in his power to restrain; that they would in future have to deal with a different class of men. He finally declared his resolution not to interfere.

Upon this communication the doubt presented itself to my mind for the first time, whether, if Newman should continue in such a frame of mind, there could be any surprise in his ultimately seceding from the Church of England. I thought I saw in his language a spirit of resistance, and even of hostility, arising from personal feelings and indignation at the censure of the great body of the Church, which boded evil. I never before doubted him. Could this great man have acted on the principle he had so long cherished, of faith in his own principles and those of the Church, he would have patiently submitted, as Pusey did in a similar strait, await-

ing the time for the storm to pass away. But upon Newman the effect was immediate. His resolution was formed at once. He would not submit, and would permit the Church to be injured in return for his condemnation. If not rebuilt in his own way, it should not be rebuilt at all, as far as he was concerned. Perhaps the uncertainty of English orders, which had formerly been propounded by Wiseman, may have here occurred, and prepared him to halt in his course.

From that time a year and a half or two years were passed in great perplexity and uneasiness by all true Churchmen. The *British Critic*, which had now passed into the hands of Newman's brother-in-law, had fallen entirely under the control of Ward, Oakeley, and other fiery partisans of Newman and of the Romanizing system, now openly avowed. Quarterly this theological review avowed principles which could only end in secession to the Church of Rome. Nor could we tell to what extent the poison was spreading. We unconsciously exaggerated the peril, and supposed that great masses of the clergy and laity would follow the leading of the *British Critic*, and might at any moment secede to Rome. At length the burden and anxiety became too intense; and though reluctant to appear as an open opponent of Newman and his friends, from old friendship, and remembrance of their services in past years against Latitudinarian infidelity, it yet seemed a paramount duty at last to uplift the standard of resistance, and to bring back Churchmen to a remembrance of the basis of their movement—fidelity to the Church of England and adhesion to the old paths—now forsaken for new paths under the influence of sophistries, and that unbounded freedom of speculation, originally advocated by Newman, and now carried to its last extremities by Ward and his associates.

I had ascertained that even the most advanced Church-

men in all parts of the country were dissatisfied by the direct Romanizing tone of the *British Critic*, which had, in fact, degenerated into a mere organ of Romanism, tending continually to secession to that communion, or to the open avowal of its principles and doctrines in the Church of England; thus fully verifying all the charges that had for years been objected to us.

It had become necessary to cut ourselves free from this decaying and dying member, and to preserve Church principles once more, at the hazard of offending individuals, and perhaps precipitating their fall. There was no remedy left. We knew not whether a secession would be the result, or to what extent. After conference with the leading Churchmen in all parts of England, and having understood that even Keble, Williams, and others most attached to Newman, joined in the general disapprobation, I resolved to prepare the work which is here reprinted, "A Narrative of Events connected with the Publication of the Tracts for the Times, with Reflections on existing Tendencies to Romanism, and on the present Duties and Prospects of Members of the Church." The work, after stating the origin of the movement of 1833, in order to show that it had not arisen, as pretended, from a secret conspiracy to restore Romanism, proceeded to narrate the subsequent declension from the original principle—the adoption of principles at variance with it, and the gradual and open avowal of Romanizing tenets. It at the same time recalled men to the remembrance of the Church principles upon which the whole movement was grounded; condemning also the Romanizing utterances of the *British Critic*, and of the Romanizing party, as inconsistent with sound principle and loyalty to the Church. The Romanizing party had boldly and impudently claimed to hold Roman Catholic doctrines on all points in the Church of England,

thus carrying out to the extreme the doctrine of Tract 90.

This work, written with great caution, so as to give the least possible offence to the parties censured (whose following was unknown, but might be considerable), and to avoid wounding Newman (whose unsettlement of faith daily became more evident from the conduct of his followers,) was put in type and circulated among all the leading Churchmen in every part of England for their emendation. They were requested to address letters to the author expressive of their own principles and condemnatory of any Romanizing tendency in the *British Critic* or elsewhere, the object being to obtain a general condemnation by leading Churchmen of the recent unsound development in the direction of Rome. All replied. Various passages were suggested to be calculated to give offence; and all, with one exception (Robert Wilberforce, who deprecated any movement in the matter, and soon after joined the Church of Rome), concurred in writing letters condemnatory of recent Romish innovations and the Romanizing spirit. A stronger evidence could not be afforded of the general adhesion to the cause of the Church. The letters, about twenty in number, were all in print, and were to have formed the Preface to the Tract, and I wish they had been preserved.

When I was about to commence publication, I received a message from the Bishop of Oxford, Dr. Bagot, who had directed the diocese during the whole time of the movement with piety and orthodox zeal, requesting me to put in his hands the proposed work for consideration. I had no hesitation in doing so, and after the bishop's examination was invited to confer upon it. The bishop, approving of the Tract generally, suggested an alteration, which he pressed earnestly upon me as a point on which he felt the deepest anxiety, namely to omit the letters of censure

received from all the leading Churchmen of England, and which were printed in the preface. The bishop, alluding to his own anxiety and part in the whole question, besought me to omit these letters, on the ground that such a censure from Churchmen generally might, he feared, irritate the Romanizing party to such a degree as to drive them at once to Rome; that already many were trembling on the verge of the abyss, and none could tell what they would do if such a universal condemnation appeared.

I fully admitted the force of this argument, and at once consented to expunge the letters of censure, though I felt very reluctant to lose the benefit of their support. I did not even keep copies of them. The work appeared. This incident shows the critical nature of our then position. We were surrounded by secret enemies, claiming unity with us in principles, as equally a part of the Oxford Movement. We did not know their number, or the moment when they might secede and become our open enemies.

The work when published occasioned a great stir among Churchmen, by whom it was cordially received. It was the event of the day—a declaration of war against the Romanism which had hitherto lorded it without dispute. The work is now forgotten, and the copies have become so scarce that a reprint has been called for. It is here republished *in extenso*, with the title, preface, and annotations and appendix of the original work. Certain additions and explanations have been added in the notes between brackets [ ], which may conduce to the understanding of the text. It will be understood that the whole Tract was governed by the then existing state of things—that it was intended to meet the propagation of Roman Catholic sentiments in the *British Critic*, by men professing to be of the Church of England, but really hostile to her faith, and disbelieving in her ministry and valid administration

of the sacraments. I believe that the circumstances under which this "Narrative" made its appearance have been now sufficiently explained. When it has been perused, I shall resume the thread of history, by relating the effects and results which immediately followed upon its publication, and which have exercised a decisive influence ever since upon the Church of England and the Roman Catholic cause.

A NARRATIVE OF EVENTS

CONNECTED WITH THE PUBLICATION OF THE

TRACTS FOR THE TIMES,

WITH REFLECTIONS ON

EXISTING TENDENCIES TO ROMANISM,

AND ON THE

PRESENT DUTIES AND PROSPECTS OF MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH.

OXFORD
AND
LONDON
1843

TO

THE RIGHT REVEREND FATHER IN GOD

RICHARD, LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD,

&c.

My Lord,

In thus submitting to your Lordship the humble results of an effort to separate Church principles from certain tendencies, which, to the grief of all true Churchmen, have recently manifested themselves, I am encouraged by the remembrance of the desire which your Lordship has evinced on several occasions to discriminate between the advocacy of orthodox and Catholic principles, which has been the privilege of many in this place, and any exaggerations or unsound tendencies with which it may have been occasionally combined.

The spirit of equity and of discretion in which your Lordship has, on several occasions, stated, that your "fears arose for the most part rather from the disciples than the teachers," seems to render it peculiarly fitting, that a work which is calculated to show the justice of those apprehensions, and of the distinction by which their expression is accompanied, should be inscribed to a Prelate, to whom Divine Providence has given an

especial interest in the theological movement now in progress, and to whom every member of the Church must feel deeply grateful, for the mode in which the demands of duty in most critical times have been met. I forbear to say what might be added on this subject, sensible that any words of mine would but imperfectly express the general sentiment of gratitude and respect.

I could have much wished, that a task which has been undertaken with reluctance, and only under a sense of urgent necessity, should have fallen into other and worthier hands. Strengthened, however, by the advice of many wise and eminent men, I venture thus firmly, but, I trust, in no spirit of unkindness, to draw a line between principles which many in this place and elsewhere have maintained, and certain novel theories and doctrines which seem fraught with danger to the cause of truth.

I have the honour to be,

My Lord,

Your obedient and grateful humble Servant,

WILLIAM PALMER.

PREFACE.

It is the design of the following pages to clear those who uphold Church principles from the imputation of approving certain recent tendencies to Romanism. It is hoped that a plain statement of facts, avoiding controversy altogether, may conduce to the removal of mistakes on a point of so much importance. It seems a duty to truth, not to countenance, even by silence, what we feel to be erroneous and mischievous; and although it may sometimes be difficult to express our sentiments in regard to such matters, without a feeling of apprehension that our words may cause offence to some of our brethren; we must still endeavour to discharge this duty, however painful and difficult, in a spirit of steadfast reliance on the Divine assistance, of recollection and humility as regards ourselves, and of charity towards those from whom we are obliged to differ; and I trust that such feelings have not been wholly absent during the preparation of these pages.

I am aware, that some respected friends are of opinion, that it is unnecessary at present to draw any line of demarcation between our principles and those of the *British Critic;* that the views of this periodical, and of its supporters, are not generally identified with Church principles—or that it will be found impossible to persuade the public at large that there is any line of demar-

cation between them. These objections seem to refute each other; but they shall be separately considered.

It may be, then, that some good and fair-minded men in this place and elsewhere, make such distinctions as we should wish. But is this generally the case? How few, for instance, are aware, that some of the principles advocated in the *British Critic* are displeasing to the authors of the Tracts, and to the great body of their friends! I apprehend that such distinctions are generally unknown, and if no line of demarcation is publicly drawn by the advocates of Church principles, it will be altogether impossible that they should not be identified with what they themselves disapprove.

With regard to the other objection—the alleged *impossibility* of separating Church principles, in the public apprehension, from Romanizing tendencies, I must admit that it may be difficult to persuade those who are opposed to Church principles, that they do not lead to Romanism; but it does not seem that there would be so much difficulty in setting the public right on a mere question of *fact*, i. e. whether such and such men are in reality favourable to *Romanism*—whether they intend to promote its interests—whether they actually receive its tenets or no.

I think it may be very possible to prevent mistakes on such a question from becoming prevalent, or, at least, permanent. All that seems necessary in this case is, a sufficient degree of openness.

We only want an *explicit* statement of men's views; plain and open speaking; avowals of what is our actual belief; praise where we think it due, and censure where any (be their merits in some respects ever so great) have deserved reproofs. This candour will restore mutual confidence; will reassure those whose minds have been disturbed and unsettled by novel theories, will encourage

the timid, strengthen the weak, recall fugitives, give a safe and firm rallying-point to all who are willing to uphold Church principles.

I now proceed to offer a few remarks on the contents of this pamphlet. It seemed advisable, in the first place, to place on record some account of the views on which the movement at Oxford, in 1833, was commenced, in order to show that our objects were wholly unconnected with party, or with any tendency to Romanism. A few other subjects of interest have been touched on, partly to afford desirable explanations, and partly to afford illustrations of principles and feelings. Such a selection from facts, documents, and correspondence in my possession, as could be made, consistently with the sanctity of private intercourse, is offered in corroboration of the statements which it has been deemed expedient to make.

Our movement in 1833 consisted of two branches.

Our Association speedily expanded itself throughout all England, and was responded to in Scotland and Ireland. But it speedily came to an end; after producing several important and beneficial effects, as regarded the security of the Church, and the State. I hope that I shall not be understood to represent these effects as having been amongst the *objects* of our movement in 1833. That movement was solely for the purpose of defending the Church herself in her spiritual capacity against the prevalent spirit of Latitudinarianism, and of reviving her salutary principles; but effects which we had not contemplated, and which, indeed, it would have been folly to have speculated on, followed from our movement.

The other branch of this movement was the publication of the Tracts. This was the more immediate province of my colleagues, as will be seen in the following pages. I readily admit the far greater importance of this effort, which under the management of a few eminent men,

assumed a character of permanence, and has produced great and lasting effects on the Church.

It may be thought, perhaps, that unnecessary advantages will be given to opponents of Church principles by the admissions which are made in this pamphlet, of faults and indiscretions on the part of some friends. But surely such an objection will not be urged by those who exercise freely the right of pointing out defects in our ecclesiastical system. A scruple which is not felt in regard to the Church herself, cannot consistently be advanced for the protection of any class of her members. I hope, however, that no uncandid or unfair use will be made of these admissions. I am content to appeal to the better feelings of our opponents.

With especial reference to those who have recently deviated so far from all sound Church principles, and from the doctrines even of the Tracts for the Times, and of their authors, I would hope, that the following pages will be found to express no sentiments inconsistent with good-will, and charity. It has been necessary to refer to the *British Critic* in illustration of their views. An unwillingness to direct public attention to the errors of *individuals,* has induced me to refrain from adducing many objectionable passages from other publications.

With reference to the quotations from the *British Critic,* I think it necessary to direct particular attention to the statement in page 154, that the object has been only to establish the general character and tendency of a system; and that no opinion is meant to be expressed as to the exact nature or amount of impropriety in each particular passage adduced. Had any such opinion been attempted, this pamphlet must have been greatly enlarged.

In the following pages, a hope is expressed, that the *British Critic* may before long be placed under some

different management; but on further consideration, I fear that little advantage can be anticipated from such a change. The injury which has been inflicted by that periodical cannot be repaired by any mere change of management. A permanent evil has been done. Henceforward every advocate of the Church of England will be involved in most serious difficulties: his Romish opponents will always be able to quote against him the concessions and the doctrines of this periodical. I am convinced that extensive use will be made by Romanists of these concessions, for the purposes of proselytism; and even supposing the *British Critic* to recover the confidence of the Church, the danger will be in some degree enhanced, because the doctrines advanced in former numbers will only acquire new weight and consideration. These remarks are submitted with deference to better judgments.

I trust that in speaking of recent theories of "Development," a sufficient distinction has been drawn between the views of an eminent and much respected writer, and those of other men.[1] I would not be understood to offer any opposition to the former, when rightly understood; but there is much vague and dangerous theory elsewhere afloat on the subject. The continual cry of the *British Critic* for "development," "progress," "change," "expansion of ideas," the actual and fearfully rapid progress of individual minds, the unsettlement of principles and notions openly avowed; all is calculated to create very serious uneasiness and alarm. Such impetuosity and recklessness seem better fitted to revolutionize than to reform. We shall, I trust, be always ready most earnestly to support rational and well-considered plans for increasing the efficiency of our eccle-

[1 Newman had not then published his work on "Development," to which these remarks do not apply.]

siastical system, and for removing all proved defects; but we should remember, that hasty and unnecessary alterations may only involve us in difficulties even greater than those which may now be felt.

In the latter part of this pamphlet will be found a brief statement of some of the leading Church principles, with a view to mark the difference between them, and the errors of Romanism on the one hand, and of ultra Protestantism on the other. In so brief a sketch, many features of interest will necessarily have been unnoticed; but I trust that enough will have been said, to remind the reader of the general character of the Church system.

I have now to offer the expression of deep gratitude to many respected and valued friends for their support and encouragement, and for the valuable suggestions which I have received from various quarters. They have tended materially to relieve anxieties which the peculiar circumstances of the time had excited; and I shall always feel thankful for the assurance which they have afforded, that real and substantial agreement in all great principles is generally combined with a most cordial attachment to the National Church, and with a resolution to maintain her distinctive principles with as much zeal against any approaches to Romanism, as against tendencies towards the opposite class of errors.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE

THE ASSOCIATION OF FRIENDS OF THE CHURCH IN 1833—ITS RESULTS 95

CHAPTER II.

TRACTS FOR THE TIMES—THE HAMPDEN CONTROVERSY . . 119

CHAPTER III.

PARTY-SPIRIT—TENDENCY TO ROMANISM 136

CHAPTER IV.

CHURCH PRINCIPLES STATED—DUTIES OF CHURCHMEN—PROSPECTS OF CHURCH PRINCIPLES 183

APPENDIX, comprising additional Notes, and Correspondence 208

A

NARRATIVE,

&c.

CHAPTER I.

THE ASSOCIATION OF FRIENDS OF THE CHURCH IN 1833—ITS RESULTS.

I AM desirous of placing on record some circumstances connected with the origin of the theological movement, which has for some years occupied so large a space of public attention. They will not be without interest, proceeding, as they do, from an eye-witness of the events which he is about to relate; from one, who was zealously engaged in the promotion of this now celebrated movement at its very origin, and whose personal friendship and regard for those, who have been so long known as the more prominent of its supporters, has never suffered the slightest diminution.

To Mr. Perceval we are indebted for an account of the proceedings in 1833 and 1834, and for copies of various documents connected with those proceedings. For reasons which will appear in the course of the following remarks, I was unwilling that my name should be published in Mr. Perceval's narrative, as having taken

any share in the original movement; but subsequent circumstances have induced me to throw off this reserve, and to acknowledge and avow my responsibility. I shall now proceed, without further preface, to a statement of the events of which I was an eye-witness; and shall not hesitate to express my sentiments, with the freedom and openness, which circumstances seem imperatively to require.

At the beginning of the summer of 1833, the Church in England and Ireland seemed destined to immediate desolation and ruin. We had seen in 1828, the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts cutting away from the Church of England one of its ancient bulwarks, and evidencing a disposition to make concession to the clamour of its enemies. In the next year—the *fatal* year 1829—we had seen this principle fully carried out, by the concession of what is called "Roman Catholic Emancipation;" a measure which scattered to the winds public principle, public morality, public confidence, and dispersed a party, which, had it possessed courage to adhere to its old and popular principles, and to act on them with manly energy, would have stemmed the torrent of revolution, and averted the awful crisis which was at hand.

Deep as was the consternation, and almost despair of the friends of order and religion at this time, when we beheld our rulers sacrifice (*avowedly* under the influence of intimidation) a constitution, which, in the very moment of its ruin, they admitted to be essential to the security of the Church—Deep as was then our alarm and indignation, at being thus delivered over, bound hand and foot, into the power of a hostile Ascendency;[1] into the hands

[1] This was written on the supposition, that the State would retain its power over the Church, and permit the latter no liberty of action.]

of a parliament reckless of the high and sacred interests of religion, and now for the first time numbering by law amongst its members, Romanists and Dissenters; there were yet in store for us events of a more fearful nature. The first sound of the tocsin of revolution at Paris in 1830, ought to have re-united the scattered friends of established order in England: it left them engaged in violent dissensions; and, with the exception of the *Morning Post,* the whole Press of England threw itself into the cause of the revolutionary party in France. Ere long the tide began to flow upon our own shores; and the Tory Aristocracy which had forsaken the Church in yielding Emancipation, were now hurled from their political ascendency; and the REFORM BILL of 1831, a just retribution for their offence, made for a time the democratic principle all-powerful in the State.

It was then that we felt ourselves assailed by enemies from without and from within. Our prelates insulted and threatened by ministers of state—continual motions made for their expulsion from the legislature—demands for the suppression of Church-rates, on the avowed principle of opening the way for a total separation of Church and State—clamours, loud and long, for the overthrow of the Church—Dissenters and Romanists triumphing in the prospect of its subversion, and assailing it with every epithet calculated to stimulate popular hatred. In Ireland, some of our clergy assassinated; the rest deprived of their incomes, and reduced to the verge of starvation; while the government looked calmly on, and seemed to encourage this terrible persecution. In fine, an uninterrupted series of injuries, dangers, and desertions, was closed by the sacrifice of *ten* bishoprics in Ireland; and we were advised to feel thankful that a more sweeping measure had not been adopted.[2] What

[2] If the report be well founded, as I believe it to be, that the

was next to come? Was this to lead to similar measures in England? Was the same principle of concession to popular clamour, which had led to the desolation of the Irish Church to gratify the Romish democracy there, next to be exemplified in the dismemberment of the English Church, in the hope of conciliating its antagonists? Who could tell? We had seen even prelates of our own Church make concession after concession, on this and other points which should have been defended at all hazards.

Nor was this the worst. The prevailing spirit of innovation had begun deeply to infect the Church itself. Writers had been at work for some time, disseminating superficial and fanciful novelties on religious questions; disdaining all appeal to authority; and encouraging a taste for a rationalizing theology. The publications of the author of "The Natural History of Enthusiasm," which went directly to the subversion of all existing religious systems, as well amongst the Dissenters as in the Church, had been unsuspectingly and greedily absorbed by the public mind. The theory of Church and State had been handled by adherents of a rationalizing school which had grown up in Oxford; on various principles indeed, but in such modes as to generate dissatisfaction with existing institutions. Elements thus prepared were stimulated into unnatural activity by political convulsions. We were overwhelmed with pamphlets on Church Reform. Lord Henley (brother-

original intention of the Ministry was to suppress a considerably larger number of sees, and that they were dissuaded from this design by a Prelate [Whately] whom they had recently nominated to his high office, the gratitude of the Church is eminently due to that distinguished Prelate. The recent exertions made in the same quarter to revive the bishopric of Leighlin, and the personal sacrifices which were offered on that occasion, are beyond praise.

in-law of Sir Robert Peel), Dr. Burton, Regius Professor at Oxford, and others of name and influence, led the way; and nothing was heard but dissatisfaction with the Church—with her abuses—her corruptions—her errors! Each sciolist presented his puny design for reconstructing this august temple built by no human hands. Such was the disorganization of the public mind, that Dr. Arnold of Rugby ventured to propose, that all sects should be united by Act of Parliament with the Church of England, on the principle of retaining all their distinctive errors and absurdities. Reports, apparently well founded, were prevalent, that some of the prelates, especially the Bishop of London,[3] were favourable to alterations in the Liturgy. Pamphlets were in wide circulation, recommending the abolition of the Creeds (at least in public worship), and especially urging the expulsion of the Athanasian Creed; the removal of all mention of the blessed Trinity; of the doctrine of baptismal Regeneration; of the practice of absolution. In fact, there was not a single stone of the sacred edifice of the Church, which was not examined, shaken, undermined, by a meddling and ignorant curiosity.

Such was our condition in the early part of the summer of 1833. We knew not to what quarter to look for support. A Prelacy threatened, and apparently intimidated; a Government making its powers subservient to agitators who avowedly sought the destruction of the Church. The State, so long the guardian of that Church, now becoming its enemy and its tyrant. Enemies within the Church seeking the subversion of its essential characteristics. And what was worst of all—*no principle in the public mind to which we could appeal;* an utter ignorance of all rational grounds of attachment to the Church; an

[3] That excellent prelate, on being informed of the report, took immediate measures to contradict it.

oblivion of its spiritual character, as an institution, not of man, but of God; the grossest Erastianism most widely prevalent, especially amongst all classes of politicians. There was in all this enough to appal the stoutest hearts; and those who can recall the feelings of those days, will at once remember the deep depression into which the Church had fallen, and the gloomy forebodings which were universally prevalent.

But in those hours of darkness, there were hearts, many hearts, burning with shame and grief for the general apostasy around them; hearts which were yet beating high at the thought, that amidst the universal shipwreck and treason, there was ONE, whose protection might be relied on; and which were ready at the first opening of possibility, to devote themselves to the service of the Church. I had myself the gratification of promoting in some degree the first movement of reaction in 1832, by publishing in the *British Magazine*, which had been just established by a lamented friend, the Rev. Hugh J. Rose, a series of articles on dissent, which by means of a large mass of evidence derived from dissenting publications, directed public attention to the small number, the difficulties, and declining state of the dissenting interest. I had the satisfaction to find, that those articles not only attracted earnest and uneasy attention amongst dissenters themselves, but that they were extensively quoted and copied by many writers of the Church (often without acknowledgment); and that they formed the basis of several books (such as the "Letters of L. S. E. to a Dissenting Minister"), which were directed against the principles and practice of dissent, with the most perfectly satisfactory results.

These efforts, however, could do little to dispel the fears to which we were continually subject; and in the early part of 1833, the suppression of bishoprics in

Ireland, accompanied by most grievous persecutions of the Church, brought our evils to the climax.

I had not been very intimately acquainted with Mr. Newman and Mr. Froude,—and was scarcely known to Mr. Keble, or Mr. Perceval,—when our deep sense of the wrongs sustained by the Church in the suppression of bishoprics, and our feeling of the necessity of doing whatever was in our power to arrest the tide of evil, brought us together in the summer of 1833. It was at the beginning of long vacation, (when, Mr. Froude being almost the only occupant of Oriel College, we frequently met in the common room,) that the resolution to unite and associate in defence of the Church, of her violated liberties, and neglected principles, arose. This resolution was immediately acted on; and while I corresponded with Mr. Rose,[4] Mr. Froude communicated our design to Mr. Keble. Mr. Newman soon took part in our deliberations, on his return from the continent. The particular course which we were to adopt, became the subject of

[4] The necessity of associating in defence of the Church had already suggested itself to many minds. I have before me a series of Resolutions for the formation of a General Church Association, agreed on by some Clergy in Cheshire in February and March, 1832; but this design was unsuccessful. I had been in correspondence with Mr. Rose early in 1833 on the same subject; but the particular plan suggested seemed to be open to objections. In a letter dated Hadleigh, Feb. 1, 1833, he says, "That something is requisite, is certain. The only thing is, that whatever is done ought to be *quickly* done: for the danger is immediate, and I should have little fear if I thought that we could stand for ten or fifteen years as we are." In another communication on the same subject, dated March 8, he says, "You will see we quite agree as to the end, quite agree as to what is desirable, but I cannot allow myself to hope that the means would be feasible. * * * * * * Still I think the notion of creating a spirit of attachment and closer union, is so valuable, that I wish you would give me a letter for the Magazine on the subject."

much and anxious thought; and as it was deemed advisable to confer with Mr. Rose on so important a subject, Mr. Froude and myself, after some correspondence, visited him at Hadleigh, in July, where I also had the pleasure of becoming personally acquainted with Mr. Perceval, who had been invited to take part in our deliberations. The conference at Hadleigh, which continued for nearly a week, concluded without any specific arrangements being entered into; though we all concurred as to the necessity of some mode of combined action, and the expediency of circulating tracts or publications on ecclesiastical subjects, intended to inculcate sound and enlightened principles of attachment to the Church. On our return to Oxford, frequent conferences took place at Oriel College, between Mr. Froude, Mr. Newman, Mr. Keble, and the writer,[5] in which various plans were discussed, and in which especial attention was given to the preparation of some formulary of agreement, as a basis for our Association.

Mr. Perceval has published three forms of association (pp. 12, 13, and 17). The first two of these papers were, I believe, principally composed by Mr. Keble; and considerable discussion took place on various parts of them. It is, however, a mistake to suppose that either of them was finally adopted as the actual formulary of agreement. It always seemed to me, that, however true in a certain sense might be some of the doctrines comprised in those documents, their introduction as fundamental conditions of our union might create much embarrassment, and might limit the sphere of our utility, in prematurely obtruding on the friends of the Church questions, which either from want of knowledge, or from the difficulty

[5] Mr. Keble and Mr. Perceval were not resident in the University. The former occasionally visited us. Mr. Rose was at Durham, and could no longer be consulted.

of adopting unobjectionable phraseology, might cause offence rather than promote harmony and co-operation. There was some difference of opinion on the question of the union of Church and State, which some of our friends seemed inclined to regard as an evil; while I (and perhaps another) was desirous to maintain this union, notwithstanding the evidently hostile disposition of the State, and its tyrannical suppression of the Irish sees, because, as it appeared to me, we could not attain absolute independence, and the power of self-legislation, and liberty to elect our bishops, except by sacrificing the endowments of the Church, on which our whole parochial system, and the dissemination of religious truth throughout the land, are practically dependent; and, considering that no plan had been suggested for the election of bishops which was not liable to objections and to evils, fully as great as any which may exist under the present system of nomination by the Crown; considering also the fearful consequence of leaving our clergy as a body dependent on the voluntary contributions of the people, who were wholly unaccustomed to the discharge of such a duty, and would be disposed to shrink from it; I could not but think that any efforts which went towards the separation of Church and State, would be injurious to the Church, as well as unavailing in themselves, and prejudicial to our union. Circumstances might be supposed indeed, in which the Church should be prepared to make the sacrifice of her endowments; i.e. if she could only retain them *by relinquishing her vital principles;* but on the occasion now under consideration, we were not reduced to this extremity.

It was after many discussions on these and similar subjects, that I prepared a draft of the *third* formulary, printed by Mr. Perceval (p. 17), which was revised and improved by a friend, and was finally adopted

as the basis of our further proceedings; it was as follows:—

Suggestions for the Formation of an Association of Friends of the Church.

It will readily be allowed by all reflecting persons, that events have occurred within the last few years, calculated to inspire the true Members and Friends of the Church with the deepest uneasiness. The privilege possessed by parties hostile to her doctrine, ritual, and polity, of legislating for her, their avowed and increasing efforts against her, their close alliance with such as openly reject the Christian Faith, and the lax and unsound principles of many who profess and even think themselves her friends, these things have been displayed before our eyes, and sounded in our ears, until from their very repetition we almost forget to regard them with alarm.

The most obvious dangers are those, which impend over the Church as an Establishment; but to these it is not here proposed to direct attention. However necessary it may be on the proper occasion to resist all measures which threaten the security of Ecclesiastical property and privileges, still it is felt that there are perils of a character more serious than those which beset the political rights, and the temporalities of the Clergy; and such, moreover, as admit and justify a more active opposition to them on the part of individual Members of the Church. Every one who has become acquainted with the literature of the day, must have observed the sedulous attempts made in various quarters, to reconcile Members of the Church to alterations in its Doctrines and Discipline. Projects of change, which include the annihilation of our Creeds and the removal of doctrinal statements incidentally contained in our worship, have been boldly and assiduously put forth. Our Services have been subjected to licentious criticisms, with a view of superseding some of them, and of entirely remodelling others. The very elementary principles of our ritual and discipline have been rudely questioned. Our Apostolical polity has been ridiculed and denied.

In ordinary times, such attempts might safely have been left to the counter operation of the good sense and practical wisdom, hitherto so distinguishing a feature in the English character. But the case is altered, when account is taken of the spirit of the present age; which is confessedly disposed to regard points of religious belief

with indifference, to sacrifice the interests of truth to notions of temporary convenience, and to indulge in a restless and intemperate desire of novelty and change.

Under these circumstances it has appeared expedient to Members of the Church in various parts of the kingdom, to form themselves into an Association on a few broad principles of union, which are calculated from their simplicity to recommend themselves to the approbation and support of Churchmen at large, and which may serve as the grounds of a defence of the Church's best interests against the immediate difficulties of the present day. They feel strongly, that no fear of the appearance of forwardness on their part should dissuade them from a design, which seems to be demanded of them by their affection towards that spiritual Community, to which they owe their hopes of the world to come, and by a sense of duty to that God and Saviour who is its Founder and Defender. And they adopt this method of respectfully inviting their Brethren, both Clergy and Laity, to take part in their undertaking.

OBJECTS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

1. To maintain pure and inviolate the doctrines, the services, and the discipline of the Church; that is, to withstand all change, which involves the denial and suppression of doctrine, a departure from primitive practice in religious offices, or innovation upon the Apostolical prerogatives, order, and commission of bishops, priests, and deacons.

2. To afford Churchmen an opportunity of exchanging their sentiments, and co-operating together on a large scale.[6]

The formulary thus agreed on was printed, and was privately and extensively circulated amongst our friends in all parts of England, in the autumn of 1833. Our intention was not to form a society merely at Oxford, but to extend it throughout all England, or rather to form similar societies in every part of England. But, finding that jealousy was expressed in several high quarters at the formation of any associations, and the notion being also unacceptable to Froude and others [Newman] at

[6] Appendix, Note A.

Oxford, we ceased, after a time, from circulating these papers, or advising the formation of societies. Some permanent effects, however, were produced. Societies were organized at Bath, Bristol, Ripon, Cheltenham, Winchester, and, I believe, in other places, which have on many occasions done eminent service to the Church. The expressions of approbation which were received from the clergy in all parts of the country inspired us with increased hopes and confidence of success. We thus learned that the principle of ancient loyalty and devotion was deeply rooted in the parochial clergy of England, and that they were prepared to unite with us in vindicating the spiritual rights of their despised and almost persecuted Church.

It was suggested by friends in the country, that this object might be forwarded if some deputation were to proceed from Oxford to different parts of England, with a view to explain more definitely our intentions and designs. Having no other engagements at the time, I readily undertook this mission; and at Coventry, Winchester, and in London, had the pleasure of meeting many of the parochial clergy, and several eminent dignitaries of the Church, to whom I detailed the circumstances which had led a few retired and studious clergymen to combine together for the Church of England, against its opponents, whether Romanists, Dissenters, or Rationalists. The exposition of our views was received with general approbation, and I returned to Oxford with a heart full of the deepest gratitude to that Providence which had so far signally blessed our undertaking, and of confidence in the high principle and unshaken constancy of the parochial clergy of England.

Thus encouraged, our next proceeding was to devise some mode of giving public and combined expression to

that sound and healthy feeling which we found so generally prevalent in the Church;[7] to obtain some *pledge* of loyalty and attachment to ancient principles, which might inspire mutual confidence, and reunite the scattered and despondent friends of religion. Some declaration of attachment to the Church which might be subscribed by the clergy was then thought of, and it speedily assumed the form of an Address to the Archbishop of Canterbury, which I drew up, and which was communicated to the most influential of our friends in London for revision, and was finally printed, and circulated in the following form:—

To the Most Rev. Father in God, William, by Divine Providence Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England.

We, the undersigned Clergy of England and Wales, are desirous of approaching your Grace with the expression of our veneration for the sacred office, to which by Divine Providence you have been called, of our respect and affection for your personal character and virtues, and of our gratitude for the firmness and discretion, which you have evinced in a season of peculiar difficulty and danger.

At a time, when events are daily passing before us which mark the growth of latitudinarian sentiments, and the ignorance which prevails concerning the spiritual claims of the Church, we are especially anxious to lay before your Grace the assurance of our devoted adherence to the Apostolical Doctrine and Polity of the Church over which you preside, and of which we are Ministers; and our deep-rooted attachment to that venerable Liturgy, in which she has embodied, in the language of ancient piety, the Orthodox and Primitive Faith.

And while we most earnestly deprecate that restless desire of change which would rashly innovate in spiritual matters, we are not less solicitous to declare our firm conviction, that should anything from the lapse of years or altered circumstances require renewal or correction, your Grace, and our other Spiritual Rulers,

[7] [The parochial clergy had called upon us at Oxford to direct them how to give effect to their sentiments.]

may rely upon the cheerful co-operation and dutiful support of the Clergy in carrying into effect any measures, that may tend to revive the discipline of ancient times, to strengthen the connexion between the Bishops, Clergy, and People, and to promote the purity, the efficiency, and the unity of the Church.

Much discussion arose on the question, whether this Address should include an expression of confidence in the *other prelates*, as well as in the Archbishop of Canterbury, which our friends in London considered as essential, in order to obviate jealousies. This difference of opinion caused extreme embarrassment, for the Address was already printed and in circulation amongst the clergy, when it arose. Many of our friends were in great alarm; and from Mr. Rose I received letters expressing very serious apprehension that this Address would cause schism in the Church. Our difficulties, indeed, soon became very great. Some of the clergy were apprehensive that the Address might lead to counter-addresses from the party in favour of Church Reform. Others were unwilling to subscribe anything which seemed to contemplate the possibility of reform in our ritual or discipline. Others again supposed the Address to be intended as a condemnation of all change and improvement. Besides this, we found the superior clergy, dignitaries of the Church, &c., in general, extremely timid and apprehensive; in a few cases, very strongly opposed to us. We had no encouragement from any bishop. The prelates in general, permitted the matter to take its course; but two or three of the bishops were decidedly opposed to the Address until near the conclusion, and their clergy were the last to subscribe it. There was, indeed, much misapprehension abroad as to our motives, and we had no means of explaining those motives, without the danger of giving publicity to our proceedings, which, in the then state of the public mind on Church matters, might

have led to dangerous results. There was also no inconsiderable jealousy at the apparent presumption of young men without station in the Church, undertaking so great a work; and we found this to be particularly the case in Oxford.

I had ample opportunity for observing the difficulties which surrounded us; for, being comparatively free from other engagements, the management of the Address, and of the extensive correspondence to which it led, chiefly devolved on me. The correspondence with the diocese of Chichester, and parts of London, Bristol, and Carlisle, was in other hands; but that with the remainder of England and Wales, was carried on by the writer. It was his effort to remove the prevalent misconceptions of our objects; and in this, aided by several friends, he was so far successful, as to witness the gradual accession of the great body of the clergy to the Address. As its completion approached, he went to London to receive the signatures from all parts of the country, which were appended to the Address; and in February, 1834, this document with the signatures of nearly 7000 clergy[8] (and more were pouring in) was presented to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, at Lambeth Palace, by a Deputation consisting of members of the Lower House of Convocation, and representatives from the Universities; including many of the Deans, Archdeacons, Proctors of Chapters and of Diocesan clergy, Professors and Heads of Houses from Oxford and Cambridge, some of whom have since been strongly opposed to the theology of the Tracts.[9] To the history of those Tracts, attention shall presently be directed; but in the mean time I shall proceed in my narrative of proceedings connected with the Address to the Archbishop.

[8] The Addresses from several dioceses had been previously transmitted to his Grace.

[9] Note B.

During the circulation of the Address amongst the clergy, applications had been received from many steadfast members of the Church amongst the laity, expressing their desire to sign that or some similar declaration. It was impossible to refuse a request so honourable to those who preferred it, and promising so important an aid to the Church. We applied in the first instance to an eminent member of the House of Commons, whose devotion to the Church had been nobly proved, and to another gentleman of distinguished character and rank; and they proceeded to Cambridge in December, for the purpose of conferring with some of our leading friends in high official station there. The result of their deliberations appears in the following Address, which it was proposed to circulate amongst the laity:—

To His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.

May it please your Grace,

We the undersigned lay members of the Church, over which, by Divine Providence, your Grace, as Primate of all England, most worthily presides, approach you with the assurance of our respectful and dutiful confidence, at a period when that Church is attacked with more than usual violence, and by efforts more than ever combined.

We desire to assure your Grace, that in maintaining in all their integrity the institutions of our venerable and apostolical Establishment, your Grace and the several rulers of the Church, who in their respective orders may be associated with your Grace in the maintenance of our Ecclesiastical polity, will be supported by our cordial and zealous exertions.

We are attached alike from conviction and from feeling to the Church of England. We believe it to have been the great and distinguishing blessing of this country; and as laymen, we feel, that in the preservation of that Church, we have an interest not less real, and not less direct, than its more immediate ministers.

While we are not insensible to the possibility of advantage to be derived to all its members from such revived exercise of discipline and superintendence on the part of its bishops, priests, and deacons,

as may be sanctioned by the competent authority within the Church, we desire to uphold unimpaired its doctrines, as set forth in its Creeds and Articles, and to preserve that venerable Liturgy, in which is embodied, in the language of ancient piety, the orthodox and primitive faith.

Our earnest hope, and our humble prayer is, that God may still bless all the labours of the friends of the Church, may overthrow the designs of all its enemies, may cause kings still to be its nursing fathers, and queens its nursing mothers, and may render it from age to age the means of promoting His glory, and the advancement of His kingdom upon earth.

It seemed, however, that the honourable and high-minded men who had drawn up this admirable document, found themselves so circumstanced, that the Address could not be put in circulation by them. Considerable difficulties presented themselves in various directions.[1] Under these circumstances it was requisite to look elsewhere for the management of our measure. I was now in London, deputed to arrange this affair, in company with a friend,[2] from whose judgment and zeal great advantages were derived. Observing the difficulties which had arisen, we deemed it necessary to begin again *de novo*, by placing the matter in other hands. A declaration was accordingly prepared in London by a layman, whose virtues, abilities, and munificence had for many years procured for him the veneration of all true Churchmen, and very extensive influence in the management of its principal Societies. This declaration was conceived in the following terms:—

A Declaration of the Laity of the Church of England.

At a time when the Clergy of England and Wales have felt it their duty to address their Primate with an expression of unshaken adherence to the doctrines and discipline of the Church of which

[1] Note C.

[2] The Rev. Richard Greswell, M.A., Fellow of Worcester College.

they are Ministers, We the Undersigned, as Lay-members of the same, are not less anxious to record our firm attachment to her pure faith and worship, and her apostolic form of government.

We further find ourselves called upon, by the events which are daily passing around us, to declare our firm conviction, that the consecration of the State by the public maintenance of the Christian Religion is the first and paramount duty of a Christian People; and that the Church Established in these realms, by carrying its sacred and beneficial influences through all orders and degrees, and into every corner of the land, has for many ages been the great and distinguishing blessing of this Country, and not less the means, under Divine Providence, of national prosperity than of individual piety.

In the preservation, therefore, of this our National Church in the integrity of her rights and privileges, and in her alliance with the State, we feel that we have an interest no less real, and no less direct, than her immediate Ministers; and we accordingly avow our firm determination to do all that in us lies, in our several stations, to uphold, unimpaired in its security and efficiency, that Establishment, which we have received as the richest legacy of our forefathers, and desire to hand down as the best inheritance of our posterity.

It was considered necessary to place the management of the declaration in the hands of a committee of lay members of the Church, who continued for some months to sit in London. The correspondence in which we had been engaged, enabled me immediately to place the committee in communication with zealous and influential laity in seventy of the principal towns and districts of England and Wales, who were ready and willing to lend their assistance in the good work. The committee, however, though animated by the best spirit, and sincerely desirous of the welfare of the Church, were not successful in obtaining such a number of signatures to the declaration as might fairly have been expected, under efficient management.[3] The committee having resolved to receive

[3] Note D.

only the names of heads of families, the declaration when presented to the Archbishop of Canterbury, in May, 1834, contained 230,000 signatures.[4]

The *circulation* of the declaration amongst the laity, however, which took place under the auspices of the committee, produced far more important and decisive effects than could have resulted from any assemblage of signatures. It produced the first awakening from that torpor of despair into which the friends of order and religion had been plunged by the triumph of hostile principles under the Reform Bill. The country was still under the formidable domination of political unions: it was still trembling at the remembrance of insurrection and devastation at Bristol and Nottingham.[5] It beheld a feeble band of patriots in the House of Commons, struggling for the remnants of the British Constitution against a majority of revolutionists fivefold more numerous than themselves. The House of Lords, indeed, nobly stemmed wave after wave of revolution, but we knew not how soon the threats and execrations of the disappointed democracy might rise into another storm, and sweep away this last bulwark of law and order. It was then that the principle of attachment to the Church of England called forth the first public demonstration of attachment to all that Englishmen should hold most dear and sacred. The Declaration of the laity was sent to all parts, and meetings of Churchmen were convened in all the principal towns. So great was the apprehension at this time, that they did not venture at first to assemble openly, for the purpose of recording their attachment to the Established Church; admission was in general

[4] Note E.

[5] In Oxford we were more than once alarmed by reports, that the Birmingham Political Union intended to march through Oxford on their way to London, and to sack and burn the colleges.

restricted to those friends who were provided with tickets.

The result, however, was beyond what the warmest friends of the Church could have ventured to anticipate. Day after day did the *Standard*, then our steady friend and coadjutor in defence of the Church,[6] teem with accounts of meetings of her faithful children in all parts of England. Nottingham, York, Cheltenham, Northampton, Derby, Plymouth, Dorchester, Poole, Liverpool, Norwich, Newcastle, Hull, Bristol, Bath, Gloucester, and many other places, vied with each other in heart-stirring declarations of devotion and fidelity to the Church of their fathers, and resolutions to maintain its rights and its doctrines. Petitions in support of the Church began rapidly to pour into the House of Commons. It seemed as if feelings long pent up had acquired energy from restraint and compression; and the Church beheld with astonishment the power and the substantial popularity of which it was possessed.

Nor was this the whole amount of benefit derived. The resolute declarations of attachment to the Church which

[6] I had taken the liberty of suggesting to the accomplished Editor of this Journal, in the preceding autumn, the expediency of writing a series of articles designed to encourage the friends of the Church, by showing the numerical weakness of the Dissenters. This policy was most admirably pursued by the *Standard*, and its good effects became instantly visible. Although the writer deeply regrets that the *Standard* has, for some time past, taken so much of a party tone in religious questions, he gratefully tenders to one of the most powerful and consistent political writers of the age, the expression of warm gratitude for services to the Church in former years, the value of which cannot be too highly appreciated. This journal, however, and the *St. James's Chronicle*, have ceased to merit the confidence of the friends of Church principles. That confidence never ought to be extended to any journal which fosters divisions in the Church. [It is needless to say that these remarks do not apply to the existing *Standard*.]

thus emanated from the people, found an echo in the heart of Royalty itself, and his most gracious Majesty, King William IV., in May, 1834, took occasion to address to the Prelates of England, assembled on the anniversary of his birthday, his royal declaration of devoted affection to the Church, and of his firm resolution to maintain its doctrines,[7] a declaration which was hailed by all friends of the Church with the strongest feelings of gratitude and loyal attachment.[8] I may here add, that in the autumn, shortly after these events, King William availed himself of an opportunity to call the Conservative party to the head of affairs; and the impulse which had been given to loyal and constitutional principles by the Ecclesiastical movements of the spring and summer, at once displayed itself in the presentation of thousands of addresses of thanks and congratulation to the King, on the dismissal of the ministry, which were succeeded by more solid proofs of principle, in the return of so great a body of Conservative members of Parliament as instantly and permanently arrested the march of revolution, and raised the Conservative party in parliament nearly to an equality with that of its opponents.

Here we must pause in this branch of the narrative, having carried on the series of our efforts and their consequences, to the revival of sound political feeling in the nation, and the elevation of the Conservative party. Our movement, however, had *no political object of any kind.* We understood indeed that it was rather disapproved by some Conservative leaders. We were certainly never aided or encouraged by them in any way.

It will always be some pleasure to reflect that we were instrumental, in some degree, under Divine providence, in awakening the slumbering spirit of religion and of

[7] Note F. [8] Note G.

patriotism, a spirit which mere political Conservatism might not have found it easy to evoke; and I trust that the narrative of our obscure and humble, but devoted exertions in the cause of the Church, may encourage the friends of that Church to rely for its defence, not on the professions of political parties, or on the gratitude of those whom they may have raised to power, but on their own good cause, and on the affectionate loyalty of its adherents.[9]

One more result of our exertions, however, must not be passed over in silence. I can sincerely say, that if there was one object more than another which we should have been happy to realize, it was *the union of the Church*. Separated as we were from existing party-feelings and associations, we only looked to the general good.[1] I am sure that we felt as kindly towards one set of men as towards another. None of our publications alluded to party differences. Mr. Rose, in establishing the *British Magazine*, had resolved to keep clear of questions which had divided the Church,[2] and in this we cheerfully concurred. I *know* the kind and charitable feelings which existed in others towards the party called "Evangelical," and am sure that no different sentiment has ever existed in my own mind. The controversies which have since arisen, and have been carried on in a spirit tending to widen our divisions, are a source of grief and disappointment.

How great, then, was our rejoicing to find that in the course of our exertions, men of different theological schools were brought nearer together, were inspired with feelings of mutual respect and esteem, and were convinced that religion, and religious truth, were more widely extended than they had been accustomed to think.

[9] Note H. [1] Note I. [2] Note K.

The wounds of the Church were every day healing by the balm of brotherly love.

This plain and unvarnished statement of facts will, it is hoped, exculpate those who were engaged in the Association of 1833 and 1834, from any imputation of designs hostile to the doctrines or discipline of the Church of England, or favourable to the introduction of Romanism. The views which were entertained in common by those who took the lead in that movement, are represented by the documents which they circulated, and by them alone. The "Suggestions for the formation of an Association of Friends of the Church," and the "Address to the Archbishop of Canterbury," were the results of our conferences, and they alone represent our united sentiments. In those documents, which were received with favour by the great body of the Clergy, we expressed our disapprobation of "*alterations in the doctrines and discipline of the Church,*" our resolution "to *maintain pure and inviolate the doctrines, the services, and the discipline of the Church.*" We asserted "*our devoted adherence to the Apostolical doctrine and polity of the Church, . . . and our deep-rooted attachment to the Liturgy, in which she has embodied, in the language of ancient piety, the orthodox and primitive faith.*" Our attachment to the Church of England is therefore unquestionable.

Our combination was for the purpose of resisting Latitudinarian attempts against the established doctrine and discipline, and of defending the principles of the Church. It is, of course, impossible to assert positively that individuals amongst us may not have had *private* views more or less favourable to Romanism, but most assuredly the existence of such tendencies was wholly unknown; and from all that passed, I have no hesitation in saying, that had there been any suspicion of a tendency to Romanism, our combination would have been im-

possible. And as far as one individual can answer for the sentiments of others, with whom he was on terms of intimate and unreserved communication, I can safely say, that not one of my friends or colleagues had any designs in favour of Romanism.

CHAPTER II.

TRACTS FOR THE TIMES—THE HAMPDEN CONTROVERSY.

We now turn to the history of the "Tracts for the Times," and for this purpose must retrace our steps to the autumn of 1833. It had been unanimously agreed amongst those who originated the movement, that the press ought to be made the means of bringing before the clergy and laity the great principles on which the Church is based, and which had been almost wholly forgotten. We felt it necessary to teach people that the duty of adhering to the Church of England rested on a basis somewhat higher than mere acts of parliament, or the patronage of the State, or individual fancy. We were anxious to impress on them, that the Church was more than a merely human institution; that it had privileges, sacraments, a ministry, ordained by Christ; that it was a matter of the highest obligation to remain united to the Church.

In the necessity of such teaching we all concurred most heartily; but no particular arrangements had been made as to the composition or revision of Tracts, their title, form, &c.;[1] when the publication of the Tracts

[1] The difficulties which were felt in regard to the publication of Tracts by an Association, led to the designed omission of any mention of Tracts in the "Suggestions" which formed the original basis of our Association. I have now before me a paper containing

commenced, and was continued by several of our friends,[2] each writer printing whatever appeared to him advisable or useful, without the formality of previous consultation with others. Several Tracts were thus privately printed and dispersed amongst friends and correspondents in the country. I received these Tracts, which were published during my absence, and aided in their distribution at first, because their general tendency seemed good, though I confess that I was rather surprised at the rapidity with which they were composed and published, without any previous revision or consultation; nor did it seem to me that any caution was exercised in avoiding language calculated to give needless offence. Circumstances had induced me to pay some attention to the writings of Romish and Dissenting controversialists, and it seemed clear that the Tracts contained gratuitous admissions, of which these opponents would almost certainly avail themselves.

Unwilling, however, to interrupt the harmony of our

proposed additions to the "Suggestions," in the following terms: "In this early stage of its proceedings, the Association does not feel itself competent to publish Tracts on its own authority; but it invites its friends to write Tracts upon the subjects which are the basis of its union, and undertakes to circulate them, pledging itself to no more than an approbation of the general sentiments they contain."

"Or should it be thought an awkwardness for the Association to circulate Tracts which it is not expressly to sanction, thus:"

"'In this early stage, &c. But it invites its friends to distribute Tracts, after first submitting them to the Committee, as well as otherwise exert themselves with a view of recommending the general objects which it is pledged to further.'"

This addition, however, was not thought advisable. The *revision* of the Tracts, which here seems to be contemplated, was not afterwards approved of. It was even decidedly opposed.

[2] [The leader in the movement was Newman, but others supported him.]

proceedings, I did not at first express my sentiments, further than urging the necessity of greater caution and discretion. The respect and regard due to the authors of the Tracts rendered me anxious to place the most favourable construction on everything which they wrote, and to hope that my apprehensions might be ill-founded. In the course, however, of the extensive correspondence in the autumn and winter of 1833 which has been mentioned, so many objections were raised by the clergy against parts of the Tracts, and so many indiscretions were pointed out, that I became convinced of the necessity of making some attempt to arrest the evil. With this object I made application in a direction [Newman] where much influence in the management of the Tracts was exercised, and very earnestly urged the necessity of putting an end to their publication, or, at least, of suspending them for a time.[3] On one occasion I thought I had been successful in the former object, and stated the fact to several correspondents; but the sequel proved that I was mistaken.[4]

I did not, however, entirely relinquish the hope of being of some use, and therefore early in 1834, after the conclusion of a protracted visit to London, on the affairs of the Association, I most earnestly urged in the quarter where most influence existed [Newman], the absolute necessity of appointing some *Committee of revision*, to

[3] Note L.

[4] This effort is alluded to in Froude's Remains. I cannot but think that Froude's influence, which was very great, was on many occasions exerted in a direction contrary to mine. He has expressed his disapprobation of the only Tract, in the composition of which I was in any degree concerned (Tract 15, "On the Apostolical succession in the English Church.") At the request of a friend I furnished a few notes for this Tract, which were filled up and expanded by another, so that I am not in any way responsible for the Tract.

which all the Tracts might in future be submitted previously to publication; and that authors should no longer print in the series whatever might seem advisable to themselves. I urged this, on many grounds, and with all the arguments which I could think of, observing that although it was true, that the Tracts were really only the productions of individuals, and although those individuals disclaimed everywhere the notion that the Tracts emanated from any *body of men*, yet still the mere circumstance of their being published *anonymously*, in *the same place*, and in *a series*,[5] did, and would continue to impress the public with a belief, that they were *not* the writings of individuals—that they represented the doctrines held by our Association—and that we should be held responsible for all the statements contained in the Tracts. I observed, that in proposing a system of revision by some Committee, there was not the least wish to lower the tone of doctrine, or to conceal any part of Catholic truth; but that the only object was to obviate the use of mere incautious expressions, of language likely to give needless offence, and to be laid hold of by enemies. It seemed that no sufficient answer was returned.[6] * * * * * * * * *

This was the substance of our discussion, which was renewed more than once on successive days; but in the conclusion I had the mortification of finding my endeavours wholly fruitless, and that there was a fixed and unalterable resolution to admit no revision of the "Tracts for the Times."

It may be, perhaps, that a greater amount of benefit to the Church has resulted from the continuation of the Tracts than would have been attained, had these suggestions been adopted. Perhaps, too, others perceived

[5] The title of "Tracts for the Times" had not yet been adopted.

[6] I am not at liberty to publish the remainder of the conversation, including the objections to my proposal.

more clearly than I did that my views on doctrine and discipline were not in perfect harmony on all points with those of the writers of the Tracts, and that a Committee of Revision, of which I should have been a member, would really have imposed a far greater restraint on those writers than I should have been conscious of, or designed. Certainly I had, in private conversation with Mr. Froude, and one or two others, felt that there were material differences between our views on several important points. I allude more particularly to the question of the union of Church and State, and of the character of the English and the Foreign Reformers. Mr. Froude occasionally expressed sentiments on the latter subject which seemed extremely unjust to the Reformers, and injurious to the Church; but as his conversation generally was of a very startling and paradoxical character, and his sentiments were evidently only in the course of formation, I trusted that more knowledge and thought would bring him to juster views.

The disappointment which had been experienced in the efforts to obtain some system of revision for the Tracts, and the apprehensions which I could not but feel for the result, together with a growing perception of the differences which existed between my views and those of my colleagues, led to the conviction that any further direct co-operation with them was impossible. I accordingly ceased to take any active part in their proceedings, or to be possessed of that *intimate confidence*, with which I had previously been honoured; while, at the same time, the friendship which had been cemented by a community of principles on the more important and sacred subjects, and by a community of interest and exertion in the cause of the Church, prevented me from adopting any course of opposition which might have been calculated to cause pain or embarrassment.[7] . . . . . .

[7] Actuated by such sentiments, I could not resolve to allow my

But, though thus reduced to silence and inaction, I was a deeply interested spectator of the progress of events. I could distinctly see (and with regret), that the theology of the Non-jurors was exercising a very powerful influence over the writers of the Tracts. Collections of Non-juring works had been made, and Hickes, Brett, Johnson, Leslie, Dodwell, &c. were in the highest esteem. To this source it was easy to trace much of that jealousy of State interference, much of that assertion of unlimited independence of the Church, and above all, much of that unfavourable judgment of the English and foreign Reformation, which so largely characterized the Tracts and other connected works. The Non-jurors, from whom these views were, perhaps unconsciously, borrowed, had been pressed by their opponents with precedents of civil interference in Church matters at the period of the Reformation; and their remedy too frequently was to assail and vilify the Reformation itself.[8] Their separation from the Established Church also led gradually to their discovery of various supposed defects in our Liturgy and institutions. Certain ceremonies which had been prescribed in the first Book of Common Prayer of Edward VI., and which had been subsequently omitted, were represented by several Non-juring writers as essentials; and their views on this subject had been partially adopted by various authors of merit, even in the Church of England, as by Wheatley (in his book on the Common Prayer). Having devoted great attention

name to be mentioned in Mr. Perceval's narrative, because it would have imposed on me an obligation of stating the reasons why I had ceased to co-operate with the authors of the Tracts. The circumstances, however, of the present time, oblige me to lay aside such personal considerations.

[8] Heylin had adopted too much of the same tone in his History of the Reformation, and from causes somewhat similar.

to the study of the ancient Liturgies, I was perfectly satisfied, that the Non-juring writers (such as Johnson, &c.) were by no means qualified, by the amount of their information, to form a sound judgment on such points. It was, therefore, a matter of great concern to observe, that their views were developing themselves in the writings of friends.

Deeply uneasy as some of us felt on witnessing such questionable doctrine gradually mingling itself with the salutary truths which we had associated to vindicate, and often as we were driven almost to the verge of despair, in observing what appeared to be a total indifference to *consequences;* yet, finding that more experienced members of the Church, in London and throughout the country, were not equally apprehensive; and seeing also the sort of miraculous success which TRUTH was obtaining, notwithstanding these mistakes; we hoped that all would still be well, and consoled ourselves with the reflection, that no great religious movement had ever taken place without a certain amount of accompanying evil. There seemed also to be little probability that extreme and questionable views would prevail; for they had already become the subject of hot controversy; and the disapprobation which was so generally expressed, would, it might be hoped, have rendered their reception impossible; so that, in fine, they would probably have but little influence, and the only result would be, to establish great Ecclesiastical principles, and a firmer attachment to the English Church, in the public mind.

Had we not been restrained by these considerations and hopes, there can be no doubt, that many of those who have been identified with the Tract theology, would have publicly avowed that dissent on some points, which they took no pains to conceal in conversation with friends. I am satisfied, indeed, that such considerations alone

would not have sufficed to keep us silent,[9] had we not been reluctant to join in the ungenerous and furious outcry, which had been raised by certain periodicals; and which confounded and mingled in common denunciation truth and error, the most sacred principles of the Church and the questionable theories of some of its adherents. We shrank from being made the instruments of party-hate; and from seeing our language perverted and distorted to ends the most remote from our intention; perhaps to the assault of truths which we held most dear and sacred, or to the destruction of brethren, whose principal fault seemed to be indiscretion, and whose faults were more than balanced by their merits and their services.

At this distance of time, and after all the discussion which has taken place in regard to the "Tracts for the Times" and other connected writings, it can hardly be necessary that those who have hitherto studiously refrained from engaging in the controversy, either for or against the Tracts, should deviate from the course which they have so long pursued. Whether their judgment has been right or wrong in preserving silence as far as they could on these agitating topics, and in abstaining from open opposition where they felt that they could not always approve, still it were now, at least, *too late* for them to enter on the discussion. That discussion, indeed, ought to be considered at an end, as regards various points, in consequence of the judgments which have emanated from ecclesiastical authority. It may be that we are not prepared to concur in every particular opinion or statement which occurs in those episcopal judgments.

[9] It should be added, indeed, that several leading friends of church principles, such as Dr. Hook and Mr. Perceval, felt themselves obliged at last publicly to announce their dissent on various points.

We may also be of opinion, that an unnecessary degree of severity has been exercised in some instances. But on the whole, I am persuaded that the points which have excited the combined animadversion of the majority of those Prelates who have spoken, are points which the great body of those who are really attached to Church principles have never approved; and on which they have always looked with distrust and dissatisfaction.

Admitting, as we do, most cordially and fully, the great services which have been rendered to the cause of truth and of piety by the authors of the Tracts, services which have been acknowledged even by their opponents, and which the chief pastors of the Church have not scrupled to commend in terms of the highest approbation; and deeply sensible as we are that they have established great verities, called attention to some distinctive features of our Church which had been too much neglected, and frustrated the designs of Latitudinarianism: it is still undeniable, that the friends of Church principles have not been able to concur in every position which has been advanced by individual writers connected with the Tracts. They have, indeed, been not unfrequently placed in very serious embarrassment by the incaution of individuals, by indiscreet publications, and actions. They have felt that opponents were, in various ways, furnished with additional objections and arguments, and that they were themselves committed by proceedings of which they could not approve; and I really cannot but be of opinion that they have exhibited very great patience and forbearance throughout the whole of these difficulties. If those whose *actual* sentiments have met with opposition have suffered much, surely the position of those who have been exposed to suspicion, jealousy, and enmity, *on account of the sentiments of others which they really disapprove,* is not less

distressing. They have, however, endured in silence the imputations under which they labour, when they could easily have relieved themselves by avowing their sentiments, and thus lending their aid to the opposite party. This is a view of the subject which has not been taken: it is really deserving of some consideration. It may suffice at least to show, that those advocates of Church principles who are not prepared to approve of all the theories advanced in "Froude's Remains," or in some particular Tracts, have had their own causes of complaint, and yet have borne them with patience and kindliness of feeling.

Explanation seems to be required on one or two points which are commonly misunderstood and misrepresented. The case of Dr. Hampden is one of these.

It was in 1836, that the discussions consequent on the appointment of Dr. Hampden to the chair of Divinity at Oxford, took place. This movement has been generally, but rather erroneously, attributed to the leaders of the Tract Association: they only took some share in it. Dr. Hampden had preached the Bampton Lectures in 1832; and an admirable theologian, who heard the concluding discourses, agreed with me, that their tendency was decidedly Rationalistic; that they went to the extent of representing our articles of faith, and our creeds, as based on merely human and uncertain theories. The publication of these lectures was unusually protracted. In 1834, on occasion of the attempt made to force dissenters on the Universities, Dr. Hampden published his pamphlet on Dissent, in which the boldest latitudinarianism was openly avowed, and Socinians were placed on a level with all other Christians. If any doubt could have existed on the tendency of the Bampton Lectures, it would have been removed by the clue to Dr. H.'s views furnished by this pamphlet. So great was the

excitement of the time, however, when the whole University, banded together as one man, met, confronted, and overthrew the Ministerial attempt to change the character of its institutions,[1] that this pamphlet attracted comparatively little notice. In 1834, soon after the appearance of the pamphlet, the friend mentioned above,[2] urged on me the necessity of some protest against Dr. Hampden's doctrines being made, lest impunity might lead to a repetition of similar attempts against the Articles. It seemed to me, however, that any such measure might be productive of harm, in drawing public attention to statements which, appearing as they did in by no means a popular form, would probably attract but little notice.

Thus stood matters when, early in 1836, Dr. Burton, Regius Professor of Divinity, died. The University was not long in suspense as to his successor. In a few days we were electrified by the intelligence that Dr. Hampden was to be appointed to the vacant chair. This measure seemed a designed insult to the University for its resistance to the Ministry in the preceding years. It was like an attempt to force latitudinarian principles on the Church. It was to place in the chair of Divinity, with the power of instructing and guiding *half the rising Clergy of England,* one who would undermine the authority of our Creeds and Articles. The dangerous principles which, we had hoped, would have remained unobserved, in writings of no very popular character, would now be at once brought into public notice, invested with authority, and received by all the rising generation. Some influen-

[1] On this occasion the Rev. W. Sewell of Exeter College first became generally known to the public by his admirable pamphlets in vindication of the University.

[2] [Hugh James Rose, Dean of Bocking, and Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury.]

tial friends therefore of Church principles, unconnected with the Tracts, visited all parts of the University, inviting its members to instant exertion, in the hope of averting the danger by which we were threatened.

The result was, that a meeting was held in Corpus Christi common-room, where we elected, as our chairman, the Rev. Vaughan Thomas, B.D., on whom the independent party had previously fixed, as eminently qualified for the office by his experience, habits of business, ability, eloquence, soundness and firmness of principle, and freedom from party connexions.[3] Our petition to the Throne against this appointment was rejected, and Dr. Hampden became Professor. We met again, and petitioned the Heads of Houses to bring before Convocation a censure of the errors advanced in Dr. Hampden's writings. It had been previously ascertained that the Professor refused to retract a single iota of his doctrines. Again and again was our petition rejected by the majority of the Board of the Heads of Houses, and again did we return to the contest with increased numbers and determination. All divisions and jealousies were forgotten in this noble effort. It was at length successful to a certain extent, and the Heads of Houses concurred in bringing forward a censure on Dr. Hampden (a different measure, however, from what we had desired),[4] which was passed in Convocation by an overwhelming majority.

[3] We had previously communicated to Professor Pusey our wish that he should not take any prominent part in the affair, and our intention of nominating the Rev. V. Thomas as our chairman—a communication which was received in the kindest and most friendly spirit.

[4] Our desire was that the *specific errors* advanced might be censured, in order that the students of theology might be put on their guard: we did not ask for the censure of any *person*. The statute proposed by the Heads of Houses, as a sort of compromise, condemned Dr. H. personally, without specifying his errors. We,

That this movement was not guided by the Tract writers, may be gathered from the fact, that the Principal of Brasenose College, afterwards Lord Bishop of Chichester, was the firm and persevering leader of our cause amongst the Heads of Houses, while the permanent committee appointed to prepare our addresses, comprised *four* members who were either opposed to, or in no degree connected with the Tracts, viz. the Rev. Vaughan Thomas, B.D.; the Rev. John Hill, M.A. of St. Edmund Hall; the Rev. Edward Greswell, B.D. of Corpus Christi; and the Rev. W. Sewell, M.A. of Exeter College. Mr. Newman and Dr. Pusey were the other members of the Committee, the latter of whom it was essential to appoint in consideration of his rank in the University.

The condemnation of Dr. Hampden, then, was not carried by the Tract writers; it was carried by the *independent* body of the University. The fact is, that had those writers taken any leading part, the measure would have been a total failure; for the number of their friends at that time, bore *a very small proportion* to the University at large, and there was a general feeling of distrust in the soundness of their views. I cannot but regret that the moderation and independence which were then so general, were afterwards superseded to a certain extent, by an extreme devotion to particular opinions on the one side, and a vehemence of hostility on the other, which have been equally injurious to truth and to Christian charity. The independent body was gradually diminished by the removal from the University of several wise, sober-minded, and influential men, who were lost to us, either by preferment or by death. In their place another generation arose, trained in different schools. Hence the

however, accepted this measure as the best that could be expected under the circumstances, being satisfied that it was neither unjust nor unprecedented.

development of extreme opinions; the temerity of assertion which day by day seemed to acquire fresh vigour from the reproofs which it encountered; the adoption of questionable rites and decorations in public worship, and the importance which was attached to them: and on the other hand, a jealousy of extreme views, gradually rising into vehement hostility and denunciation. We could even see a kind of personal enmity, which, with a steady and unremitting scent for destruction, tracked and hunted down every fault, each mistake in doctrine, each folly in practice, every unguarded word, or look, or deed; and found in them all damning proof of dishonesty and of all imaginable crimes against the Church of England.

One measure which must have materially, though unintentionally, increased the influence of the writers of the Tracts, was the formation of a Theological Society, in 1835, the meetings of which were held at Dr. Pusey's house in Christ Church. This Society was to be managed by a committee, of which the Regius and Margaret Professors of Divinity were to be *ex officio* members, while the other places were to be occupied by Mr. E. Greswell, Dr. Pusey, Mr. Newman, Mr. Oakeley of Balliol College. A wish was kindly expressed, that my name should also appear on this committee; but I declined, together with Dr. Faussett, Mr. Greswell, and Dr. Burton.[5] Theological essays were read at the meetings of the Society,

[5] I ought to state, that in the communications which passed on this subject, the most earnest wish was expressed by Dr. Pusey and Mr. Newman to prevent this Society from assuming anything of a party character, or developing any peculiar theological system. With this view they endeavoured to associate with themselves men who were wholly independent. Had we been able to meet their wish, some evils might have been obviated: but occupations and difficulties of various kinds interfered.

which were held once a fortnight; and discussion was encouraged at first, but was afterwards discontinued. I attended one of their meetings, and felt by no means satisfied of the wisdom and expediency of the design. Several of the papers read on these occasions afterwards appeared in the "Tracts for the Times." They were listened to by attentive audiences, consisting of bachelors and masters, to the number of fifty, and upwards.

Although there was certainly much occasionally in the pages of the *British Critic*, which seemed overstrained and fanciful; much also which savoured of sympathy with Rome, or of a spirit of discontent with the English Church; and although the tide of opposition was continually increasing; yet there was much on the whole for some time to encourage the sincere friends of Church principles. The argument was all on their side: intemperate clamour, invective, unfairness, were wholly on the other. It sometimes occurred to those friends of Church principles, who were not exposed to the brunt of public obloquy, that their warmest sympathies were due to men who, notwithstanding some errors in judgment, were, in fact, standing in the fore-front of the battle, breaking down the reign of ignorance and prejudice, and making way for the gradual prevalence of enlightened principle—for its triumph over even their own mistakes.

It was thus that we were circumstanced, when in 1841 the celebrated Tract 90 was published. I have already spoken of the spirit of almost personal hostility, which in some quarters was so painfully exhibited towards the author of this Tract. I had with unspeakable concern observed the growth of feelings which I will not trust myself to characterize, and had privately endeavoured in vain to infuse some kinder and more generous temper, to soothe asperities, and to suggest favourable constructions. The untiring persecution which the author of

Tract 90 and his friends had sustained, had often excited the displeasure of those who witnessed it. On the publication of Tract 90, we learnt that a furious agitation had been set on foot in the quarter alluded to, and that by dint of condemnatory letters from Prelates and others, which were carried from house to house, and by other similar means, the Heads of Houses were to be urged and almost intimidated into some measure, designed to crush the author of the Tract. I, in common with others (though by no means prepared to concur in some of the interpretations suggested by that Tract, or in some of its other positions [6]), yet made every possible effort to prevent the success of this attempt, because it seemed to emanate from merely personal hostility; to threaten consequences disastrous to the peace of the University and the Church; and, above all, because I could not but apprehend that an opportunity would be taken by party, to represent the censure as a censure of Church principles *in general*—as a blow aimed, not merely against the author of Tract 90, or the Tract Theology, but against the doctrine of Apostolical succession—against all high views and principles—against all that Churchmen are bound to value and defend. Alarmed at this prospect, many influential clergy in various parts of the country concurred in opinion with some members of the University of Oxford, who were unconnected with party, that in consequence of the censure passed by the Heads of Houses, it was necessary to make some public declaration of our attachment to Church principles, and to express our sense of the benefits which had been derived from the writings of those whom it was now attempted to crush. But this undertaking was laid aside in deference to the wishes of an authority to which our obedience was most justly due;

[6] Note M.

and I am as fully sensible of the wisdom which dictated such injunctions, as of the condescending kindness with which they were conveyed. In the then disturbed state of the public mind, our declaration would have been misunderstood, and might have been only a signal for fresh divisions.

CHAPTER III.

PARTY-SPIRIT—TENDENCY TO ROMANISM.

What has been stated will suffice to show, that dissent in some particulars from the Tracts, and from Froude's views, were combined with personal regard, and with a due sense of the services which had been rendered to the cause of Church principles. I have already disclaimed all intention of entering on the discussion of particular differences; but there are some subjects of a general nature, and so important, that I am impelled to invite the friends of Church principles to a serious examination of them. The subjects to which I allude are, the existence of party-spirit amongst some of the adherents of Church principles, and the tendency to Romanism which has recently been developed.

I would then address myself most respectfully to that large and important portion of the Church, which is, in various degrees, favourable to the principles advocated by the "Tracts for the Times." If warm personal affection and esteem for the principal authors of those Tracts, cemented by the most sacred associations, and never in thought, or word, or deed, diminished; if community of suffering beneath undeserved imputations; if anxiety for the welfare of the Church; if a life devoted, to the utmost extent of limited powers and attainments, to the inculcation of sound and Catholic principles; if some expe-

rience, as one who at the very beginning took part in that movement which has exercised so deep an influence; if these constitute any claim on attention, I trust, in humility, that I may be heard.

The eminent men themselves, who have taken so conspicuous a part in the movement connected with the Tracts, are far too humble and too wise, to conceive themselves exempt from the possibility of having made *some mistakes* in matters of opinion and judgment. No men can be more remote from a spirit of dogmatism, or from the wish that their private opinions or statements should become the standard of belief. The very liberty which was claimed for individual developments in the composition of the Tracts, the total absence of any system of revision, are sufficient to prove that the Tracts were merely designed to advocate the truth, without making any sort of pretence to infallibility. Their authors have often, and most sincerely, disclaimed all wish to form a party in the Church; their object was simply to draw attention to *neglected* truths—to appeal to the Church itself as their standard; to be of no other party.

But notwithstanding this, it is not any longer possible to conceal from ourselves the growth of *something like party* amongst some of their friends and admirers. It cannot excite any surprise that such rare endowments, such varied abilities, such noble designs, such abnegation of self, should exercise profound influence on those who came within their immediate sphere. We accordingly witnessed the growth of a feeling, which its objects would have been the first to deprecate had they been fully conscious of it—a feeling of implicit submission—of uninquiring obedience. We even saw every little peculiarity of speech, or gait, or manner, sedulously copied; certain *names* even were heard with awe. Such things, however trivial or amusing in themselves, are, when

regarded as indications of the spirit working within, worthy of deep attention. We beheld every peculiarity and novelty of doctrine, everything that was startling and perplexing to sober-minded men, instantly caught up, disseminated, erected into an article of *Catholic* faith, by young and ardent spirits. Each novelty of this kind became for the moment a sort of *Articulus stantis cadentisve Ecclesiæ*. We could not but see in this, the growth of an influence most dangerous to the Church, a disposition to create human leaders, to follow them with undiscriminating and headlong fervour, even to urge them onward continually to bolder and stronger proceedings.

In speaking thus, it is not of course meant that the spirit of party which has been alluded to is generally, or even extensively, prevalent amongst those who are favourable to the great principles of the Tracts. Nothing could be more unfounded or more unjust than any such imputation. But, needless as it may be to caution the leading friends of Church principles, as they are exhibited in the Tracts, against a spirit from which they are very far removed, I yet cannot but endeavour to draw their attention to the fact, that there is danger of party-spirit amongst some few of the younger adherents of their cause; that there is too implicit an adoption of the views of individuals; too little tolerance for different opinions; too little respect for constituted authorities, when they are supposed to be, or are, unfavourable to particular tenets.

It is against party,—against the spirit of party, with all its evil consequences,—that I would most earnestly, and with great humility, warn and entreat all who adhere to Church principles—to Catholic antiquity. They are *especially* called on to be on their guard against this extreme devotion to the opinions—this zealous vindication of the practices of particular men. The temptation is, I

admit, very strong, to draw more closely around those whom persecution in every varied form has been assailing; whose pure-minded and self-denying exertions for the public good have been thus rewarded. But, deep as is this trial to all generous minds, I would entreat them to remember, that the cause of God is yet more sacred than that of men; that it is unlawful to array ourselves under any banner, or unite ourselves in any combination, but that of Jesus Christ, and of His Church. It is a sense of the evils resulting from extreme devotion to certain leaders, the danger of taking human guidance instead of Divine, the divisions thence arising, the opposition aroused and returned with daily increasing irritation, the risk which we run of sacrificing the interests of *truth* itself amidst the unreasoning outcry of popular prejudice, the consequent tendency of things to a state *far more precarious and difficult for Churchmen*,—it is the sight of these present and impending evils, which induces me to stretch forth my hands in earnest supplication to my friends, and to all adherents of Catholic principles; and to entreat them to discourage, to the utmost of their power, party associations and party feeling.

I speak not of the *name* but of the *reality* of party. The apprehension of being *stigmatized* by party *names* for adherence to unpopular principles, should not deter us from following the path of duty; but we are bound by the most solemn obligations to God and His Church, not to permit party-spirit *really to influence* our minds, our language, or our conduct; not to range ourselves under leaders, or to say, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas; not to receive implicitly their tenets, or to regard those of different tenets as necessarily wrong or uncatholic, or to withdraw from association and friendship with them, or to limit our association only to those who adopt the fullest extent of the doctrine taught by

those whom we especially admire; not to think that piety and goodness are restricted to one set of men in the Church; not to attempt to FORCE our opinions and practices on the public, in spite of its evident reluctance and opposition; not to permit in ourselves a tone of irony, or bitterness, or censure, unmingled with charity towards opponents; not to class them together under party names, and thus *assist* in forming amongst *them* the spirit and combinations of party; not to permit ourselves to *feel* unkindness, or irritation, against them, however great may be the amount of ignorance, of prejudice, of manifold infirmities and faults, which we have to encounter. There *was* a time, not long past, when the advocates of Church principles did, universally, exemplify this conduct; when firm and calm in the consciousness of right intention, they listened with charity to the clamour of their opponents. Intemperance, and intolerance, party-feeling, the spirit of sectarianism, appeared not at all amongst them; at least on the surface of things. But the [former] spirit of Newman, Pusey, and Keble has not been transmitted to all their friends. By the examples of those eminent and holy men (if no higher motive will avail), I would beseech their disciples to use more gentleness, to cultivate a greater spirit of charity, patience, forbearance, tolerance.

I must now approach, with the deepest concern, a branch of this subject, which nothing but a sense of duty could induce me to allude to—the tendency, if not to Romanism itself, yet to the greatest possible approximation towards its views and practices. If the authors of the earlier Tracts—if all advocates of Church principles—if I myself have earnestly desired [though with little hope of accomplishment] that the time might come, when the divisions which have for so many ages existed in Christendom, might, through Divine mercy, be removed,

and the universal Church from east to west might rejoice in the restoration of its ancient harmony and union—if we endeavoured to remove from amongst ourselves, all scandals, ignorances, narrow-mindedness, which might interpose an obstacle to so grand and glorious a consummation—if we laboured for the restoration of primitive and Catholic principles; for the revival of discipline so grievously collapsed; for the decency and majesty of public worship; in the hope that all other Churches might behold our wish for unity, and might, in like manner, remove from themselves all things calculated to offend—if we admitted that the Church of Christ was not limited merely to our own communion, but even that those of Rome and Greece, notwithstanding the prevalence of errors and corruptions amongst them, were still to be accounted as branches of Christianity;—if these were our designs, our motives, our admissions, I think I can answer for all advocates of Church principles, that it was never their design to compromise one particle of religious truth; to diminish in any degree the attachment of our people to the National Church; to sacrifice any of its rights, liberties, or laws; to give countenance to superstitious or idolatrous practices; or to subvert the principles of the English Reformation.

The charge of Romanizing tendencies, to which so many advocates of Church principles have been subjected, notwithstanding their exertions in the field of controversy against Rome, did not excite surprise or uneasiness amongst them, because they were well aware that the imputation of Popery is the standing argument of those who have no other mode of resisting the truth. They knew that the Puritans and the Independents imputed Popery to the Church of England herself; that episcopacy is denounced as Popish by the Presbyterians; the doctrine of the Trinity by Socinians; the retention of

Creeds and Articles by Latitudinarians; the Sacraments by Quakers; the union of Church and State by Dissenters. Satisfied of the truth of their own principles, and of the power of those principles in sustaining controversy with Romanism, they heard, without the least uneasiness, the outcry of "Popery" with which they were assailed by Dissenters; by those whose sympathies were with Dissent; and by all the avowed and open enemies of the Church and of the Constitution. They felt daily more satisfied of the strength of their position, when Dissenters, Presbyterians, Romanists, Infidels, and Radicals united in assailing them. That any tendency to Romanism should ever exist amongst *themselves;* that Church principles should ever become the path to superstition and idolatry; that they or their disciples should ever become alienated from the English Church, never entered their imaginations as possible. When their opponents charged them with such tendencies, the charge was always steadily denied. They availed themselves of every opportunity to clear themselves from the imputation of Popery. They even contended against the errors of Romanism. They had no intention to assist in the propagation of those errors.

I would appeal to the great body of the clergy and laity who have maintained Church principles, whether their honest and sincere *intention* has not ever been to maintain the truth, as much against Romish corruption on the one hand, as against Rationalizing infidelity on the other. They *know* that it has been their earnest endeavour to guard against, not merely the *imputation* of Romanism, but Romanism itself. Individuals, indeed, may have made concessions now and then, which have been laid hold of as indications of a tendency towards Romanism, and which they probably would not have made had they been conscious of the interpretation which would be placed on them. Perhaps almost every one who has

written or spoken on these subjects, may have had something to lament in his own expressions. But, however such indiscretions may have been exaggerated, and to whatever surmisings they may have given rise, the advocates of Church principles *themselves* know their real integrity of attachment to the doctrines of the Church of England, and their firm determination to resist the errors and corruptions of Romanism. It is this knowledge, this humble confidence in their own principle, which has, perhaps, in some instances led them to a degree of candour and liberality in the avowal of their sentiments, which has been misunderstood.

I might appeal, in proof of the sincerity of our opposition to Romanism, and of our attachment to the principles of the English Reformation, to the writings of the great body of our ablest and most popular writers. I might refer to the works of such men as Hook, Perceval, Gresley, Paget, Churton, Manning [then opposed to Rome], Sewell, Gladstone, and very many others. But I would appeal more especially to those writings which have been more than others exposed to the imputation of Romanizing tendencies, and I have no hesitation in saying, that a candid examination of the greater part of the "Tracts for the Times," and of the writings of their authors [as cited by Dr. Pusey in his Letter to the Bishop of Oxford in 1839], will sufficiently prove that (whatever may be thought of their individual opinions on particular points) there is throughout a continual avowal of *opposition to Rome in general*, a strong sense of its corruptions and errors, an earnest wish to resist those errors. Such would seem to be the principle and the feeling, on the whole,[1] to which the Tracts and their

[1] I would not be understood to deny that passages may be pointed out, in which we do not perceive that *firmness of tone* which ought to have been maintained.

writers have given expression, and in which the great body of those who are friendly to them have concurred.

Let me be permitted to bring before the reader some proofs of what has been now said, selected chiefly from the Appendix to Dr. Pusey's Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, "On the *tendency to Romanism imputed* to doctrines held of old, as now, in the English Church." This appendix is entitled "Extracts from the Tracts for the Times, the Lyra Apostolica, and other publications; showing that to oppose ultra-Protestantism *is not to favour Popery.*"

I first turn to the "Tracts for the Times."

The Tracts maintain, that at the Reformation we were "*delivered from the yoke of Papal tyranny and usurpation,*" and from the "*superstitious* opinions and practices which had grown up during the middle ages;"[2] that "there is not a word in Scripture about our duty *to obey the Pope;*"[3] that "*Luther and others of the foreign Reformers,* who did act without the authority of their bishops," were justified in so doing;[4] that one object of the Tracts was to "*repress that extension of Popery*" for which religious divisions are making way.[5] They profess "*enmity against the Papistical corruptions of the Gospel;*"[6] a persuasion that the Romish "*Communion is infected with heterodoxy; that we are bound to flee it as a pestilence; that they have established a lie in the place of God's truth.*"[7] It is admitted that "our Church is *a true branch* of the Church Universal;" that "*it is Catholic and Apostolic,* yet not Papistical."[8] Transubstantiation is represented as "a manner of presence *newly invented* by Romanists."[9] It is declared, that the Romish doctrine of Justification is "*unscriptural;*" that the doctrine of

[2] No. 15, p. 4. [3] Ib. p. 5. [4] Ib. p. 11.
[5] Vol. i. Advert. p. 5. [6] No. 20, p. 1. [7] Ib. p. 3.
[8] Ib. p. 4. [9] No. 27, p. 2.

Transubstantiation is "*profane and impious;*" that the denial of the cup to the laity; the sacrifice of masses as it has been practised in the Roman Church; the honour paid to images; indulgences; the received doctrine of Purgatory; the practice of celebrating divine service in an unknown tongue; forced confession; direct invocation of Saints; seven Sacraments; the Romish doctrine of Tradition; the claim of the Pope to be universal bishop; and other points, are respectively blasphemous, dangerous, full of peril, gross inventions, at variance with Scripture, corruptions, contrary to Scripture and antiquity.[1] We are told to "apply Vincentius's test—antiquity; and *the Church of Rome is convicted of unsoundness.*"[2] Amongst the "practical grievances" in the Roman communion are, "the denial of the cup to the laity; the necessity of the priest's intention; the necessity of confession; purgatory; invocation of saints; images."[3] It is held, that "*the twelfth century*" was a time "*fertile in false steps in religion;*"[4] and that "the *addresses to the blessed Mary* in the Breviary carry with them their own *condemnation* in the judgment of an English Christian;" that these usages "do but sanction and encourage that *direct worship of the blessed Virgin and the Saints,* which is the great practical offence of the Latin Church."[5]

I next turn to the writings of Dr. Pusey, in which we find the same sort of disapprobation of Romanism.

We read there, that "the Romanist, *by the sacrament of Penance,*" would forestall the sentence of his Judge.[6] The "*corrupt* Church of Rome" is spoken of.[7] The Reformers who suffered under Mary are entitled "*Martyrs.*" Rome is described as "*a seat of Antichrist.*"[9] "The

[1] No. 38, p. 11. [2] Records of the Church, No. 24, p. 3.
[3] No. 71, p. 9. [4] No. 75, p. 7. [5] Ib. p. 7, 9.
[6] Pusey on Baptism, p. xiv. [7] Ib. xviii. [8] Ib. 105.
[9] Ib. 201.

error of Transubstantiation" is said to have "*cast into the shade the one oblation once offered on the cross.*"[1] Rome is admitted to have forsaken "the principles of the Church Catholic;" and to have "stained herself with the blood of saints."[2] Our Church, "alone of all the reformed Churches, was purified in the fire and *purged by the blood of martyrs*, and had the evidence of affliction that she was a beloved child."[3] The idolatries committed in the worship of saints in the Church of Rome (without any protest or objection from her authorities) are amply exhibited in the postscript to Dr. Pusey's Letter on the Articles treated of in Tract 90; and the conclusion of the whole is that "*while these things are so*, although we did not separate from Rome, yet, since God has permitted that Rome should separate us from her, *we see not how the Anglican Church could reunite with her, without betraying the trust which she owes to her children.*"[4]

Few writers have expressed their sentiments more decidedly on this subject than Mr. Newman. A sort of retractation of some strong expressions has, indeed, lately appeared, which is supposed to have proceeded from this eminent writer; but we have no right to infer that such retractation (though it may, perhaps, with some reason have added to the apprehensions which had been previously excited in the minds of Churchmen) was intended to apply to the *general view* which had been taken of the Romish system: it seems only to relate to particular modes of expression. I shall therefore, without hesitation, refer to the following passages as confirmatory of the views developed in the Tracts, and in Dr. Pusey's writings.

"We agree with the Romanist," he says, "in appealing to *antiquity* as our great teacher, but *we deny that his*

[1] Ib. 2nd ed. p. 6.
[2] Sermon on Nov. 5, p. 29.
[3] Ib. p. 32.
[4] Pusey's Letter on Tract 90, p. 217.

doctrines are to be found in antiquity."[5] We are thus cautioned against making advances to Rome: "If we are induced to believe in the professions of Rome, and *make advances towards her*, as if a sister or a mother Church, which in theory she is, we shall find too late that we are in the arms of a pitiless and unnatural relation."[6] With reference to the doctrine of Purgatory it is said, "it may be shown that its existence is owing to a like indulgence of *human reason*, and of private judgment upon Scripture, *in default of Catholic tradition.*"[7] "There have been ages of the world in which men have thought too much of *Angels*, and paid them excessive honour; honoured them so perversely as to forget the supreme worship due to Almighty God. This is the sin of a *dark age.*"[8] "We believe" that Popery is "*a perversion or corruption of the truth.*"[9] "We are restrained by many reasons from such invocations [of Saints] . . . First, because the practice was not *primitive* . . . next, because we are told to pray to God only, and invocation may easily be corrupted into prayer, and then becomes idolatrous."[1] "The present authoritative teaching of the Church of Rome, to judge by what we see of it in public, goes very far indeed to substitute another Gospel for the true one. Instead of setting before the soul the blessed Trinity, it does seem to me as a popular system to preach the blessed Virgin and the Saints."[2]

In fine, Mr. Keble has spoken of the "*exorbitant claims of Rome*"—its "undue claims, and *pernicious errors*"[3]—its "image worship and *similar corruptions* by authority."[4]

[5] Newman on Romanism, p. 47. [6] Ib. p. 102.
[7] Ib. 212. [8] Sermons, ii. 400. [9] Advert. to vol. iii.
[1] Vol. iv. p. 207. [2] Letter to Jelf.
[3] Keble, Sermon on Primitive Tradition, p. 6, 20.
[4] Ib. p. 40.

He remarks that "the reverence of the Latin Church for tradition" has been unscrupulously applied "to opinions and practices *of a date comparatively recent*"—that "had this rule (the exclusion of *novelty*) been faithfully kept, it would have preserved the Church just as effectually from *Transubstantiation* on the one hand, as from the denial of Christ's real presence on the other."[5]

There cannot then, I think, be any doubt in fair and reasonable minds, that the Tracts and their principal writers were opposed to the Romish system *on the whole;* and that they concurred in this with *Protestants*, and with *the Reformers* themselves. It is true, indeed, that individual writers may have made unwarrantable concessions to Romanism on *particular points;* and it is also true, that writers may not be willing to justify every particular expression which they may have employed against Romanism; that they may even have withdrawn language which seems to them to have been unnecessarily strong, offensive, &c.; but, after all, the general principle and spirit of the passages to which I have referred (and which might easily be multiplied) was *opposed to Rome and its corruptions*, and *favourable to the Reformation.*

The repeated and explicit avowals on these points; the anxiety which was evinced to disclaim the imputation of Romanizing tendencies, obtained for the Tracts and their authors the support or the toleration of a great and influential portion of the Church, which would otherwise have been withdrawn. We endured much of what we could not approve—exaggerated views of the independence of the Church; undue severity to the Reformers; too much praise of Romish offices; a depreciating tone in regard to our own; not to speak of views on "Sin after baptism," the "doctrine of Reserve,"[6] and other

[5] Ib. p. 45, 47.

[6] It were to have been wished that the excellent writers alluded

points which were more than questionable: but we were satisfied that the imputation of Romanism was *really* unjust and unfounded; and therefore we could not assume any hostile position. Nor does it seem that any circumstance has yet occurred which should oblige Churchmen to alter their opinion of the general views and the intentions of the authors of the Tracts.

Within the last two or three years, however, a new School has made its appearance. The Church has unhappily had reason to feel the existence of a spirit of dissatisfaction with her principles, of enmity to her Reformers, of recklessness for her interests. We have seen in the same quarter a spirit of—almost *servility* and *adulation* to Rome, an enthusiastic and exaggerated praise of its merits, an appeal to all deep feelings and sympathies in its favour, a tendency to look to Rome as the model and the standard of all that is beautiful and correct in art, all that is sublime in poetry, all that is elevated in devotion. So far has this system of adulation proceeded, that translations from Romish rituals, and "Devotions," have been published, in which the very form of printing, and every other external peculiarity, have evinced an earnest desire for uniformity with Rome. Romish catechisms have been introduced, and formed the models for similar compositions. In conversation remarks have been sometimes heard, indicating a disposition to acknowledge the supremacy of the See of Rome, to give way to *all its claims* however extreme, to represent it as the conservative principle of religion and society in various ages; and in the same spirit, those who are in any way opposed to the highest pitch of Roman usurpations are sometimes looked on as little

to had so expressed themselves at first, as to preclude the necessity for *explanations*, which in such cases often come *too late*. The same remark applies to the anathemas of a respected namesake against "Protestantism," and, in its degree, to Tract 90.

better than heretics. The Gallican and the Greek Churches are considered unsound in their opposition to the claims of Rome. The latter is held to be separated from *Catholic* unity.[7] The "See of St. Peter" is described as the centre of that unity; while our state of separation from it is regarded, not merely as an evil, but a sin—a cause of deep humiliation, *a judgment for our sins!* The blame of separation, of *schism*, is openly and unscrupulously laid on the English Church! Her reformers are denounced in the most vehement terms. Every unjust insinuation, every hostile construction of their conduct is indulged in; no allowance is made for their difficulties, no attempt is made to estimate the amount of errors which they had to oppose. Displeasure is felt and expressed if any attempts are made to expose the errors, corruptions, and idolatries, approved in the Roman communion. Invocation of saints is sanctioned in some quarters; purgatory is by no means unacceptable in others; images and crucifixes are purchased, and employed to aid in private devotion; celibacy of the clergy —auricular confession, are acknowledged to be obligatory. Besides this, intimacies are formed with Romanists, and visits are paid to Romish monasteries, colleges, and houses of worship. Romish controversialists are applauded and complimented; their works are eagerly purchased and studied; and contrasts are drawn between them and the defenders of the truth, to the disadvantage of the latter. The theory of development advocated in the writings of De Maistre and Möhler (Roman Catholic controversialists), according to which the *latest* form of Christianity is the most perfect, and the superstitions of

[7] I cannot but remark on the improper manner in which this term has been used within the last two or three years. It has become the fashion in some quarters to speak of everything Romish as *Catholic*.

the sixteenth or eighteenth century are preferable to the purity of the early ages, is openly sanctioned, advocated, avowed.[8] In fine, *menaces* are held out to the Church, that if the spirit which is thus evinced is not encouraged, if the Church of England is not "unprotestantized," if the Reformation is not forsaken and condemned, it may become the duty of those who are already doubtful in their allegiance to the Anglo-Catholic communion, to declare themselves openly on the side of its enemies. I have no disposition to exaggerate the facts of the case; all who have had occasion to observe the progress of events will acknowledge the truth of what has been said. I would only add, that I hope and believe that the spirit which has been described is only to be found amongst a *very small section* of those who are popularly connected with the advocates of Church principles. I believe it is no secret, that the authors of the Tracts (several of them at least), however they may think themselves obliged to tolerate such excesses, are embarrassed by them, and deplore their occurrence. I believe that the great body of their immediate friends concur in this feeling; and, most assuredly, the advocates of Church principles in general most strongly disapprove of the spirit which has now been described, and of the existence of which I am about to furnish detailed proofs.

I will not say that the writers of the Tracts have not

[8] I cannot avoid observing, that the principle of *development*, as taught by Möhler, and adopted by the *British Critic*, is wholly subversive of that respect for the authority of primitive tradition and of the early Fathers, which was so much inculcated in the Tracts, and in other writings of their authors. The early Fathers and the primitive Church, according to this theory, represent Christianity only *in germ*, and *undeveloped;* we must look to the *latest form* of Christianity, i.e. to modern Romanism, as the most perfect model!

been, in any degree, instrumental in drawing forth this spirit; I will not inquire how far it is traceable to the publication of Froude's "Remains," and to the defence of his views contained in the Preface to the second series of the "Remains:" nor will I examine how far it may be a reaction against ultra-Protestantism: it is unnecessary now to enter on this painful and complicated question, on which different opinions may be entertained. One thing, at least, is most perfectly certain: it never was the *intention* of the advocates of Church principles to promote Romanism: they have always been persuaded that their principles do not, by any fair and legitimate reasoning, lead to that system, to which they have ever been conscientiously and firmly opposed; and I am persuaded that they will feel it a duty to offer to the Church every possible pledge of their attachment to her doctrines; that if their names have been employed to sanction any system which generates a spirit of dissatisfaction with the English Church, and tends to the revival of Romish errors and superstitions, they will adopt such measures as may be sufficient to mark their disapprobation of such a system, and their sense of its inconsistency with the principles which they maintain.

Before I proceed further in this painful task, let me, at once, disclaim any unfriendly feeling in regard to those whose opinions will come under consideration. However great and grievous may be our differences; however strong may be the feelings of sorrow, and even indignation, with which the friends of Church principles contemplate the aberrations of some brethren; yet I do most firmly and humbly trust, that those feelings are, and will be in no degree mingled with hostility to those brethren—that "our heart's desire" and our prayer will be for their spiritual and eternal welfare, and for the removal of those shadows, which have (we trust only for

a time) fallen on their path. We will not forsake the hope, that if the indiscretions of youthful and ardent minds; if inability to cope with controversial difficulties; if a too great readiness to receive without examination any theory which may be plausibly advanced; if too great confidence in intellectual power, and in theological attainment, have in fact led to doubts and difficulties; to the unsettlement of principles; to language and conduct which has deeply shocked every sober-minded and orthodox believer; the time may not be far distant, when such evils may be buried in oblivion; and the objects of our present grief and apprehension may have retrieved that good opinion, which has unhappily been, to a certain extent, lost.

The proofs of the tendency to Romanism which I am about to produce, will be chiefly taken from the *British Critic;* but let me not be misunderstood as involving in such a charge, *all the writers* who have contributed to that periodical. Many articles have appeared, which are perhaps *wholly* unexceptionable. Many others are only slightly tinged with objectionable principles. Even in the most Romanizing parts, there is frequently much which we cannot wholly disapprove. Still, there is a decided leaning *on the whole* to Romanism, and there is nothing *in opposition* to this tendency. Even the best articles present no *antidote* to the errors which are to be found elsewhere. They do not sufficiently restore the balance. They contain no refutation of Romish errors; no vindication of the opposite truths; no attempt to revive affection to the Church of England; or to defend her principles or her position. All is unhappily consistent *in fact,* and tends to one system only; though *positive evil* is not found in all the articles. Indeed the excellence of many of them, only renders the danger greater.

I am well aware that I may be exposed to the charge of unfairness in quoting isolated passages. Undoubtedly it is difficult to avoid occasional injustice in such cases; but we are absolutely without any other alternative, unless we were prepared to occupy a space altogether beyond reasonable bounds. I can only say, that I feel very confident, that no substantial injustice will be found in the following delineation.

With a view to obviate any mistakes or misconstructions, I would also premise, that the intention in adducing the following quotations, is only to exhibit *the general character and tendencies of the system*; and that no opinion is meant to be expressed, as to the extent or nature of the error or impropriety which exists in *each particular quotation*. It is unnecessary, and would require too much space, to enter on such a discussion. We need only establish the general character of the system.

I. The advocates of such a system cannot impute to us any want of *forbearance:* we have often privately protested against the principles developed in the *British Critic;* and yet the writers in that periodical have deliberately continued in their course, under the full and avowed consciousness that it is displeasing to the firmest friends of Church principles; and that it may be injurious to the Church of England. Thus, in the article on Bishop Jewell, in which the question "whether or not the English Reformers be trustworthy witnesses to *Catholic doctrine*" is determined in the *negative,* we find the following passage in reference to this question:—

"If it be urged, on the other hand, that the very agitation of such a question is inexpedient, as tending to unsettle men's minds, and to furnish matter of triumph to our opponents, we can only reply, 'Fiat justitia,' &c. Or if, again, that the mere disposition to agitate it, can hardly be displayed, *without the risk of paining, if not alienating, some of those whom one least wishes to hurt, and*

could little afford to lose, then we must close with the lesser of two evils, great as even that lesser is." [9]

In a later number of the same periodical we find the following passage, which distinctly proves, that neither the advice of friends, nor the interests of the English Church, can restrain certain writers from pursuing their course :—

"It is sometimes urged, and in quarters justly claiming our deep honour and respect, that those who feel the real unity in essentials existing among 'high churchmen' in England, *do ill in troubling such unity by making various statements about other Churches which cannot but give offence.* But we answer, that it is not only among English 'high churchmen,' but foreign Catholics also, that we recognize such essential unity. And on what single principle of Scripture or tradition can the position be maintained, to meet the objectors on their own ground, that the *unity of a national Church is the legitimate object of ultimate endeavour?* Both Scripture and antiquity are clamorous and earnest indeed in favour of unity of *the* Church; *but is the English Establishment the Church?* ..... If there *is* to be an armistice, let it be *on both sides:* if various highly-respected persons will agree never to *censure* Rome, it is plain that they will at least be doing their part in removing one reason which exists *for pointed and prominent descants in her praise.*" [1]

Thus, then, our remonstrances are disregarded: the interests of the Church of England are avowedly set aside: it cannot, therefore, be any matter of surprise, if the friends of that Church, if the advocates of her principles, feel themselves obliged to disclaim any alliance, as to views and opinions, with those who have themselves proclaimed their alienation.

II. It is now admitted on all hands, that there is a tendency to Romanism in some quarters. The author of Tract 90 stated, that his object was to keep certain

[9] No. LIX. p. 32. [1] No. LXIV. October, 1842, p. 411.

persons from "*straggling in the direction of Rome:*"[2] Dr. Pusey has written at some length on the "*acknowledged tendency* of certain individuals in our Church to Romanism."[3] Difficult as it has been for Churchmen to realize to themselves the strange and almost incomprehensible fact, that any who had ever professed Church principles should have a tendency to Romanism, they have been gradually and reluctantly compelled to admit the lamentable truth. Actual secessions from the Church, few indeed, but yet sufficiently alarming; a change of tone in private society; and above all, the doctrine continually and systematically advanced in the *British Critic*, can leave no further doubt of the existence of the evil. That evil has been distinctly perceived for more than two years by some friends of Church principles, who have been withheld from taking any decided and open step in opposition, by apprehension lest such a proceeding might have the effect of precipitating events which they would deeply deplore. It seems, however, that there is *more danger* in continuing silent, when we perceive the increasing dissemination of most erroneous and decidedly Romanizing views, under the assumed name of Church principles, and when the advocates of those principles are universally *identified* with doctrines and practices which they most strongly disapprove.

The *British Critic* has for two years been under the influence of those who are *uncertain in their allegiance to the Church of England*,[4] and who cannot be considered as friendly to her. Of this assertion it is but too easy to bring abundant proof. I shall select a few passages from the successive numbers of this periodical.

[2] Letter to Dr. Jelf.

[3] The Articles treated of in Tract 90 reconsidered, p. 153—173.

[4] [The Editor at that time has recorded his then intention to become a Romanist.]

In the Article on Bishop Jewell, the Reformation is described as "a *desperate* remedy," nay, almost "a *fearful judgment.*"[5] Bishop Jewell, who is represented "as *a very unexceptionable specimen* of an English Reformer,"[6] is condemned as a heretic.[7] We are openly advised to "withdraw our confidence" from the English Reformers.[8]

"To call the earlier Reformers *martyrs* is (we are told) to beg the question, which of course Protestants do not consider a question; but which no one pretending to the name of Catholic can for a moment think of conceding to them, viz., whether that for which these persons suffered was '*the truth.*'"[9] "Were the Church of England to be considered as in any degree pledged to the private opinions or individual acts of her *so-called Reformers* . . . one does not see how in that case persons who feel with Mr. Froude's Editors . . . *could consistently remain of a communion so fettered.* Mr. Froude's Editors have thrown out a rope which, *whether trustworthy or not*, is at all events *the only conceivable means of escape for persons in a very embarrassing position*; and for this act of kindness they deserve our thanks, *however we may pause*, as is very natural and even prudent, before availing ourselves of the proffered aid. The *question* then is this; viz. How persons cordially believing that the *Protestant* tone of thought and doctrine is essentially *Antichristian . . . can consistently adhere to a communion* which has been made such as it is, in contradistinction from other portions of the Catholic Church, chiefly through the instrumentality of persons *disavowing the judgment of Rome*, not merely in this or that particular, but in its general view of Christian truth."[1]

The solution of this difficulty proposed is the view lately advanced by a "Party which may be considered as represented in the Preface to the Second Part of Mr. Froude's Remains," that the doctrines of the English Reformers may be separated from those of our formularies.[2] It seems that this solution does not afford satis-

[5] No. LIX. p. 1.
[6] Ib. p. 4.
[7] Ib. p. 32, &c.
[8] Ib. p. 9.
[9] Ib. p. 14.
[1] Ib. p. 28.
[2] Ib. p. 30, 31.

faction: "One advantage, amongst others, of such a view *if it will but hold,*" &c. So that, in fine, the reader is left *in doubt* whether there is any sort of justification for his remaining in the communion of the English Church! The party which thus avows the uncertainty of its allegiance to our communion, announces, at the same time, what is to be the mode of its operations as long as that communion is not renounced.

"It ought not to be for nothing; no, nor for anything short of some vital truth . . . that persons of name and influence should venture upon the part of 'ecclesiastical agitators' . . . An object thus momentous we believe to be the *unprotestantizing* (to use an offensive but forcible word) of the National Church . . . . It is absolutely necessary towards the consistency of the system which certain parties are labouring to restore, *that truths should be clearly stated which as yet have been but intimated, and others developed which are now but in germ. And as we go on, we must recede more and more from the principles, if any such there be, of the English Reformation.*"[3]

This open avowal of a determination to agitate with a view to alter the character of the Church of England, and to recede from the principles of the Reformation, proves the existence of designs to which every Churchman is bound to offer his strenuous opposition. But I proceed to further proofs of dissatisfaction with the Church.

In a subsequent number of the same periodical we have the following expressions introduced by a quotation from the Romish controversialist Möhler, comprising the doctrine of development.

"This state of things [the development of doctrine in the Catholic Church united in communion] has come to an end. The Church has broken off visible unity and divided against herself; *no one*

[3] Ib. p. 45.

branch [not even the English Church!] *retains the faithful image of primitive doctrine* . . . That no branch has yet *forfeited* the power of communicating the gifts of grace, this we humbly *trust;* but . . . in vain will the humble and teachable disciple look at this moment in the ENGLISH CHURCH for one uniform pervading spirit which may guide him in his religious course . . . To refer inquirers to *primitive tradition*, essential though it be, is far from being all that is wanted." [4]

In this distress, the English Church being pronounced inadequate to satisfy our wants, our only resource, it seems, must be, "to make ourselves *in heart* a Catholic Church, to cling *anxiously* to the marks of the Holy Ghost *wherever* we can find them." [5] We are reminded, that the especial note which would attach certain minds, "the image of a true Christian Church living in that apostolic awe and strictness which carries with it an evidence that they are the Church of Christ, *is the very one which is now most signally wanting*" [6] amongst us.

The cause of the Church is, without scruple, sacrificed, whenever certain theories seem to require it. Thus we have in one place a series of arguments to prove that *Scripture in its more obvious meaning is favourable to the objections of Dissenters and other Protestants* against rites and ceremonies and the ecclesiastical system in general; the object being to show, that the private and unbiassed interpretation of the Bible is dangerous and mischievous.[7] I cannot but think that sufficient arguments may be adduced against the abuses of private judgment, without *pleading the cause of Dissenters.*[8]

[4] No. LX. p. 333, 334.
[5] Ib. p. 334, 335.
[6] Ib. p. 364.
[7] Ib. p. 424—427.
[8] It is elsewhere contended, that the whole body of ceremonial in the Church is intimately connected with the *Catholic* doctrine of the Mass; and that if, *e.g.* surplices are used, except as connected with that system, they are mere *formalisms*, and burdens on conscience.

On a subsequent occasion, the Church of England is charged with

"A '*sort of Antinomianism*,' i.e. an establishment or creed, the means of grace *necessary* to salvation, and some formularies for the most important occasions, *without* a system of religious customs, and practices, and acts of faith, sufficiently numerous, distinct, and specific, *to satisfy the wants and engage the attention of the Christian soul.*"[9]

We are informed, that

"*The last remnants of the ancient Catholic system*, with all its native good as well as its engrafted evil, had been withdrawn [in the English Church], and . . . *the glorious privilege of teaching and training the elect to Christian perfection was taken away from the Church.*"[1]

It seems difficult, if this be the case, to suppose that the English forms any part of the Christian Church.

The question of actual separation from our communion and adhesion to that of Rome, would seem to be as yet *undecided:* an opinion is very guardedly expressed, that *at present* such steps are not to be taken by *individuals.* The Romanists, it is said,

"Seem almost to rejoice more over the accessions to their number, caused by mere argument, or mere imagination, *than over all the indications, now so general, of reviving earnestness, which* (we are arguing with them all along *on their own principles*) *would seem to promise, in due time, a far more plentiful, and incomparably more valuable reinforcement* . . . The very proximity of doctrine between the English and Roman Churches . . . must the more make it *a*

Thus again Dissent and Puritanism are justified. See No. LIX. p. 24.

[9] No. LXI. p. 44.

[1] Ib. p. 53. The *right* of pointing out defects in the Church of England is contended for, No. LXV. p. 224. We are elsewhere advised to "*claim the right*" of holding that the Reformation introduced *worse corruptions* than it removed. No. LXII. p. 270.

matter for grave and mature deliberation, before a decisive step is taken. We repeat, we are speaking *ad homines;* our own opinion, as we have before expressed, is, that *individuals* would, *at present,* act (*in the abstract*) *quite unwarrantably in leaving us for Rome.*" [2]

III. Let us contrast with this systematic disparagement of the Church of England, these avowed difficulties in continuing in communion with her, the equally systematic and unscrupulous approbation and adoption of Romish doctrines and practices; their identification with *Catholicism,* the terms in which the See of Rome is mentioned, the disposition to make common cause with it, even against the more moderate of its own adherents.

"We talk of the blessings of 'emancipation from the Papal *yoke,*' and use other phrases of a like *bold and undutiful tenour* . . .[3] . We *trust,* of course, that active and visible union with *the See of Rome* is not of the essence of the Church; at the same time we are deeply conscious that in lacking it, far from asserting a right, *we forego a great privilege.*[4]

"*The lights of the Church* in the middle age, *Hildebrand,* Becket, *Innocent*" [5][these being the chief supporters of exaggerated views of the Papal authority].

The monastic system, and the superior sanctity of the Roman Church, are advocated in the following terms:—

"Is it visionary to expect, that he who leads the life *most nearly of all earthly things resembling the divine* [i.e. the monastic life] shall have truer sympathy with, and so fuller understanding of *words that are divine?* [i.e. Christian doctrine] . . . Let it be observed whether those who are so loud in their protests on the *uselessness* of a life of seclusion, believe in *any true sense the efficacy of intercessory prayer* . . . Is it the active *Protestant* or the contemplative *Catholic* who has sent forth *the sisters of Charity and Mercy, the devoted priest, the zealous missionary?* Let not the question then be ruled

[2] No. LXII. p. 294, 295.
[3] No. LIX. p. 2.
[4] Ib. p. 3.
[5] Ib. p. 15.

on the *Protestant* side, till something be done to make both reasoning and fact *less exclusively on the Catholic*"[6] [the latter being evidently the *Roman* Catholic].

The following note is appended :—

"It is far from our wish to *disparage* the efforts of Protestant missionaries, many of whom deserve our deep reverence and gratitude; still let the long quotation made by Mr. Oakeley from the *Eclectic Review* (the organ of a class of dissenters), in the Preface to his Whitehall Sermons, be well considered . . . We are free to confess, that for zeal, and entire devotedness to their object, we know of few missionaries that surpass, or *indeed at all equal*, those of the Romish Church."[7]

Amongst other evidences of a "holy life" which are held up to our admiration, in the case of La Mère Angélique, are, "prayer before the Sacrament, as soon as the perpetual adoration [of the Eucharist] was instituted at Port-Royal;"[8] the use of "shirts of hemp, in which the splinters of the stalks were left;" the harbouring of vermin; the use of "disgusting" food.[9] It is held questionable, whether some saints have not been "even marked externally by the semblance of *the five adorable wounds.*"[1] We are left in doubt, whether the healing of a young lady by *a thorn*, "said to have been one of those that pierced our Saviour," was miraculous or not. It is argued, however, that one would naturally look for such miraculous events in *monasteries*, "where persons take the kingdom of heaven by violence, *and begin on earth the life of angels*, 'neither marrying nor giving in marriage.'"[2]

Such passages as the following speak for themselves :—

"The idea that to a Christian believing all the astounding mysteries which are contained in the doctrine of the incarnation

[6] No. LX. p. 317. [7] Ib. [8] Ib. p. 386.
[9] Ib. p. 389, 390. [1] Ib. p. 401. [2] Ib. p. 403.

the further belief in the real presence, *even to the extent of the Tridentine definition*, is a serious additional tax on his credulity, is not tenable for one moment." [3]

The Pope is spoken of as "*the Primate of Christendom*," [4] as "that pontiff, whom, *to say the least*, all antiquity, with one voice pronounced the first bishop in Christendom." [5] We are reminded of the "*surprising* number of texts to which Bellarmine appeals" in favour of *Purgatory*.[6] In allusion to pilgrimages, and the anniversary feasts of patron saints in churches, which are founded "*on a firm belief, that devotions paid in particular places* had a special efficacy about them," we have this remark :—

"So natural is this feeling that it is really wonderful how it has been possible so thoroughy to root it out of the English mind. Cruel and hard-hearted indeed were those who made *the baneful attempt*, and have gained *such a mournful victory . . . Processions and pilgrimages are useful*, &c. . . . It is a mere fact . . that the peasant does find consolation in praying at places hallowed by the devotions of former generations. Let them at least enjoy the delusion, say benevolent persons; *the prayers of the saint* may have no power to save her child, but still the mother may as well fancy that they have," [7] &c.

With reference to the Papacy we have the following :—

[The Pope is] "*the earthly representative* of her [the Church's] Divine Head" [8] . . .

"The Holy See [is] *the proper medium of communion with the Catholic Church*" . . .

"*The Church* suffered also in the person of *its head*, Pius VI." . . .

"Many persons about [Napoleon] are known to have urged him to set up a Gallican Church without communion with the rest of Christendom. With that strange instinct, however, which extra-

[3] No. LXIII. p. 71. [4] No. LX. p. 431. [5] No. LXII. p. 266.
[6] Ib. p. 296. [7] No. LXIV. p. 283. [8] Ib. p. 289.

ordinary men possess, he rejected the idea; he would have his Church *Catholic* . . . and the notion of *a Catholic Church out of communion with Rome* does not seem to have struck him . . . *From Rome alone* could the despot obtain possession of *the heavenly powers* of which he wished to make use "[9] . . .

It is intimated that the *Papal excommunication* of Napoleon was amongst the principal causes of his ruin :—

"This little act of the Pope is almost imperceptible; but who knows *what unseen powers* fought with England against him whom *the Church had condemned?*"[1]

It is contended, that our *Reformation* was in spirit *Calvinistic;* that a *noble* episcopate reclaimed us from Calvinism; and that this episcopate was *inclined to a union with Rome.*[2] Whatever may be the foundation for such a statement, I cannot but think, that the object for which it is advanced, namely, the justification of an attempt to alter the doctrine of the English Church, and to assimilate it to Romanism, renders it most highly reprehensible.

Romanism is thus identified with Catholicism :—

[9] No. LXIV. p. 290. It is quite curious to observe how, on all occasions, this devotion to the Papal See manifests itself. *The Gallican Church* was unfavourable to the claim of infallibility and absolute power advanced by the popes; Gallicanism is condemned by the *British Critic* (No. LXIV. p. 285); and its opponent, M. De Maistre, receives the most unqualified praise (No. LX. p. 365). *Jansenism* is obnoxious to Rome; its defence is disclaimed by the *British Critic*" (Ibid.). The Pope condemns certain Roman Catholics at *Gibraltar*, who appeal to the temporal courts against some alterations introduced by a new "Vicar Apostolic:" the *Critic* takes part of course, with the Pope (No. LX. p. 271). The *Constitutional Church* in France, and "*la petite église*," are condemned by the *Critic:* they were both opposed to the Papal authority. (No. LXIV. p. 286. 290.)

[1] No. LXIV. p. 295.

[2] Ib. p. 385.

"The exemption by special gift from venial sin is believed by *most Catholics* to be a privilege appertaining to the Blessed Virgin. . . . We must *abandon* either this pious belief, *and the religious devotion to the θεοτόκος connected with it*, or the heresy advocated by Dr. Whately." [3]

[We are informed that Rome is] "she to whom we should *naturally turn*, our *Mother in the Faith* . . . [and reminded of] that feeling of regard and affection (*we* should rather say *deep gratitude and veneration*) which is her due." [4]

I must abstain from multiplying proofs of a tendency, which is but too evident.[5]

There are, however, some important principles of the writers in question, to which attention must be drawn.

IV. The principles to which I allude are of the most wide and comprehensive character, and tend to the restoration of Romanism in its fullest extent, and the total subversion of the Reformation.

[3] No. LXIV. p. 397. [4] Ib. p. 402.

[5] From the manner in which the works of Romish theologians, the lives of Romish saints, the decrees of popes, the Council of Trent, &c., are continually quoted in the *British Critic*, without any intimation that they represent a system different from that of the writers, one would really often suppose oneself to be perusing a Roman Catholic publication. The illusion is heightened by the repetition of most *violent* attacks on "Protestantism." I cannot but remark on the extreme temerity of those who thus indiscriminately and vehemently condemn and assail "Protestantism," when they ought to be aware that the term, in its ordinary meaning, *i.e.* as implying *opposition to the See of Rome and to Popery*, includes nothing to which any member of the English Church can object. We may not, indeed, think it advisable to designate our Church or our religion by a term which gives them a merely negative or a controversial character: but *in a certain sense, and on proper occasions*, individuals need not hesitate to avow themselves "Protestants:" and certainly recent tendencies have rendered it necessary to maintain the term. On this subject the reader may profitably consult Dr. Hook's Church Dictionary (article, PROTESTANT).

1. The doctrine of *development* (derived from the writings of De Maistre and Möhler, in which it is employed for the defence of Romanism) has been received without hesitation, and is now both privately and publicly advocated. Romish controversialists have, within the last few years, devised this mode of evading the objection which is founded on *the silence of primitive tradition*, in regard to the papal supremacy, the worship of Saints and Angels, and other Romish doctrines and practices; or on *its actual opposition* to Rome in such points. For a long time Romanists evaded this difficulty, by alleging the existence of *unwritten tradition in the living Church*, as a sufficient proof of the apostolic origin of the points in question. The uncertainty of such tradition being sufficiently apparent, they next resorted to the principle of *Reserve*, or the *Disciplina Arcani*, which accounted for the silence and apparent opposition of antiquity, by pretending that the Fathers systematically *abstained* from the mention of certain doctrines and practices, either through reverence, or from the fear of misapprehension. The weakness of this system having been demonstrated, the modern defenders of Romanism have adopted a new theory, which is essentially opposed to those of their predecessors. They have adopted the bold expedient of *avowing* that their doctrines receive but little aid from the testimony of primitive antiquity—that in fact, the early Church was perhaps *unacquainted* with those doctrines, since it is the nature of Christianity *to develop itself gradually* in the course of ages, and under change of circumstances; so that Christianity in the *middle ages*, was more perfectly developed than in the primitive times: it was the expansion of a system which existed at first, merely *in germ;* and probably, on the same principle, the *existing system* of the Roman Catholic Church may be still more perfect than that of the middle ages, and

be itself less perfect than that which is to be hereafter.

Undoubtedly there is much in this theory which is pleasing to the imagination. The notion that Religion—that Divine truth, is capable of continual progress; that we may look for developments corresponding to the advance of art and science, and analogous to the processes of change which we see operating in the natural world around us, has very great temptations to the human mind. That it has, we need no further proof than the fact that this theory is upheld by Socinians and other Rationalists; the principal difference between their system and that of the philosophical Romanists above alluded to, being, that the latter attribute to the Church that office of development which the former assign to the reason of individuals. This is not the only affinity between the systems: it is the well-known tendency of Rationalism to disregard the sentiments of former ages; to esteem itself superior in knowledge to the primitive Church. Now the doctrine of development has the same tendencies; it leads to the conclusion, that the religion of the present day is more perfect than that of the early Church: it teaches us so far *to set aside the testimony of Catholic antiquity,* on pretence, that religion was then but imperfectly understood.

But on what ground is this theory maintained? It would seem to be *a merely philosophical theory* (it was devised by Kant), based on analogies in nature, which have no necessary connexion with Revelation.[6] Scripture does not announce any gradual development of Christian truth: it speaks of "the faith *once* delivered to the Saints;" of delivering "the *whole counsel of* God;" it

[6] The author has offered some remarks on the theory of development, as advocated by De Maistre and Möhler, in the third edition of the Treatise on the Church, vol. ii. p. 443—445.

supposes throughout that "all truth" was made known to the Apostles, and by them to the Church. The principle of the Church has always been, *to hand down and bear witness to the Catholic verities which she received from the Apostles*, and not to argue, to develop, to invent. Her decisions are but the expressions of the belief which she has always entertained. Such, at least, is the *principle* which has been always avowed; and which has hitherto been asserted by Romanists themselves. On *novelties*—on doctrines or practices, either unsupported by the evidence of Scripture and Antiquity, or inconsistent with them, the Church has always looked with jealousy and suspicion. It would seem that those who uphold the theory of development, are rather inconsistent in regarding *Mediæval* Christianity as the model of perfection, whereas, according to their principle, the system of the Roman Church *at the present day* ought to be implicitly adopted.

That *Theology* is capable of development in a certain sense; that Reason under the guidance of Faith, may do much to systematize, harmonize, illustrate; and that lawful and edifying practices may be introduced by the Church in different ages, is quite certain.

I am not prepared to say, that *inferences* may not be legitimately deduced from Scripture, and that such inferences or "developments" can never be matters of faith.[7] Nor, of course, would it be possible to maintain that inferences may not have been *gradually* made in the course of ages; but there is certainly danger in theorizing on this important subject without sufficient care and discrimination. There is the more necessity for caution, because it would seem that various doctrines and theories are, at present, comprehended under the common term

[7] This question has been considered by the author, in the Treatise on the Church. Part III. ch. ii.

of "Development." The term is variously employed in the sense of "practical application;" "inference;" "expansion;" "detailed statement;" and of course such various uses of the term naturally lead to confusion. If I may be permitted to express a doubt on the subject, I would say, with deference to better judgments, that it is questionable whether an eminent writer has sufficiently distinguished between different theories and notions in his recent view of the doctrine.[8] In advocating in general the propriety of making developments or dogmatic inferences and statements under the Gospel, it seems that attention is not sufficiently drawn to the different senses in which the right of development is contended for, and to the great practical distinctions which exist between developments in those different senses. That there is such a difference is indeed evident. "Ideas and their developments," it is said, "are not *identical*, the development being but the carrying out of the idea into its *consequences*. Thus the doctrine of Penance may be called a development of the doctrine of Baptism, yet still it is *a distinct doctrine;* whereas the developments in the doctrines of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation are *mere portions of the original impression, and modes of representing it*, &c." [9] Thus, then, there are "developments" which are *inferences* from Revelation, and there are also "developments" which are mere *expressions* of Revelation. There is a wide and essential difference between these things. The former need not be, properly speaking, articles of Revelation or Faith: they may be theological truths: they may not have been deduced in the primitive ages; they need not be articles of Catholic Faith. The latter have been at all times held substantially

[8] Sermons before the University, by the Rev. J. H. Newman. (Serm. XIV.) [Newman having not yet seceded, the author speaks of him with great caution here.]

[9] Ibid. p. 331.

by the Church; they are comprised in Scripture, if not literally, yet in its spirit and meaning; they are mere *expressions* of *quod semper, ubique, et ab omnibus creditum est;* they can only be novel in form; they are in spirit and life identical with "the Faith once delivered to the Saints." The "numerical Unity of the Divine Nature," or the doctrine of "the Double Procession," may not have been defined by any *Council* till the thirteenth century,[1] but certainly those doctrines are really, in their orthodox sense, comprised in the true meaning of Holy Scripture; and the testimony of Christian antiquity is sufficient to prove that the Church was never ignorant of them. These Catholic doctrines, and others included in the doctrine of the Trinity and the Incarnation, should not be confounded with mere theological dogmas deduced from the truths of Revelation by the action of reason; lest in advocating both on the same principles and in the same mode, the Faith should be in danger of being mingled with the doctrines of men.[2]

[1] Ibid. p. 324.

[2] I am not quite prepared to concur in the statement, that "the controversy between our own Church and the Church of Rome lies, it is presumed, *in the matter of fact*, whether such and such developments are true (e.g. Purgatory a true development of the doctrine of sin after baptism), not in the *principle* of development itself" (Newman, *ubi supra*, p. 321). Its seems to me, that it is a question of *principle*, whether developments, in the sense of *inferences made by human reason*, are, or are not always to be considered as articles of Catholic Faith. If the modern theory of development be true, these developments are as Divine, and as much parts of Christianity as the great articles of the Creed. The doctrine of Purgatory, as a *development*, must be as binding as that of the Trinity; the worship of the Virgin, or of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, as necessary as the worship of God. Processions, Pilgrimages, Monastic Vows, the perpetual adoration of the Sacrament, Indulgences, &c., must be as sacred and as necessary as the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist.

The doctrine of the Discourse alluded to, would appear simply to maintain the *possibility* of developments, in the sense of "clearer statements," and "inferences," being made in the course of ages. But there is *another doctrine* afloat on this subject; and it were to have been wished that the eminent writer above mentioned had taken some notice of a view, which is undoubtedly prevalent in some quarters. It is, in short, maintained [by Newman ultimately] that the Christian Revelation may be compared to a plant which only gradually attains its perfection; and further, it is conceived, that, in point of fact, all the additions and innovations in doctrine and practice made during the middle ages, *were not corruptions, but developments*—that *e.g.* the Papal power; Transubstantiation; Purgatory; Indulgences; the worship of Images, the Virgin, and the Saints, &c., are certainly or (at least) not improbably, *developments* of Christianity. If you urge the *silence* of Scripture, or of the Fathers and Councils; or their apparent *inconsistency* with Romish doctrines or practices, the reply is at hand:—"The doctrines or practices in question were not *developed* during those ages." Thus it is continually *assumed* that Romanism is the development of Christianity; and this assumption apparently rests on the further assumption, that whatever is extensively prevalent in the Church—whatever is allowed or tolerated by her authorities, *cannot be a corruption.*[3]

I cannot now discuss this very extensive subject. It will have been sufficient to have directed attention to the dangerous theories which are afloat. It is not easy to see what may be the termination of such theories. Romanism may not be the only eventual gainer from that theory of

[3] That errors, corruptions, and idolatries, may exist extensively in the Universal Church, the writer has endeavoured to prove, in his Treatise on the Church, vol. i. pp. 82—94; vol. ii. pp. 101—112. 3rd edition.

Christianity, which supposes it to have existed originally *in germ* only. There is a subtle Rationalism in such a notion; nay, something still worse, if possible. If the Gospel is to be developed by reason; if its lineaments are to be filled up by the human mind; if it was originally *imperfect;* is there not some danger of supposing that, after all, it is only a philosophy, a science, a creation of the intellect? And again, if its processes are analogous to those which we see in nature, may not the inference be drawn that, like them, it has its period of decay as well as perfection; of extinction as well as of germination? A germ infers growth, indeed, and change, but it also infers *corruption and death.* On this principle, may not the corruption of religion be considered a law of Divine Providence? so that those who regard the Reformation as an *evil,* may be, after all, only opposing such a law; and, in fine, may not Revelation itself be supposed to have concluded its course—to have lost its vitality? I see not how, when men once begin to theorize on the development of the Christian religion, they are to prevent such speculations, or to answer them. They may discover, too late, that a philosophy which has commenced its speculations in the service of Romanism, may have found its legitimate conclusion in Rationalism, or in St. Simonianism. [Philosophy, in fact, recognizes a *negative* development which gets rid of the Christian faith by degrees.]

I have been lately informed, that the philosophy of development is taking new and ominous forms in Germany. An eminent philosopher has applied it to the doctrine of the Trinity; Duality being supposed to be the development of Unity, and Trinity that of Duality; and really one does not see what is to prevent speculative men from conceiving that Polytheism may be only the development of Monotheism. In point of fact, doctrines more or less

nearly allied to this, are to be found in the theological and philosophical systems of Brahmanism and other oriental systems of idolatry. Nor is there apparently any stronger presumption that the corruptions of Romanism are developments of primitive Christianity, than that the systems of ancient and modern Paganism are developments of the primitive religion of the world. I cannot therefore but feel and express the deepest uneasiness at the introduction of theories which may lead to incalculable evils.

The theory of development has been repeatedly put forth in the *British Critic* within the last two years, though not to its full extent. The works of Möhler indeed and De Maistre, in which it is employed in defence of Romanism, are favourite authorities with this periodical. The following passage from the former writer is quoted immediately after the announcement, that the "French translation . . . *has just come to hand:*"[4]—

"The identity of the Church's knowledge at different epochs of its existence, in no way requires a mechanical and stationary uniformity . . . this knowledge develops itself, this life extends more and more widely, becomes more and more precise, clearer; the Church attains the age of manhood . . . Tradition then contains within itself the successive *developments* of the principal germs of life . . . This development . . . arrives at maturity at the period of the great Councils of the Church."[5]

This theory is adopted, and referred to again and again.[6] But whatever may be the real views of some of the writers in that periodical, we do not find them *directly maintaining* that Romanism *actually is* the development of Christianity. They are contented to hint that such *may be the case.* It is *only* suggested that the whole *Mediæval* system, *the Papal power in its full extent, the*

[4] No. LX. p. 329. [5] Ib. p. 332. [6] Ib. p. 433.

worship of Saints and of the Virgin, the doctrine of Purgatory, &c., are *developments* of primitive Christianity, and have the same claims on our "unqualified sympathy."

"How painful a reflection to any one, who has imbibed so much of the Catholic spirit, as to burn for union with all those who so much as bear the name of Christ . . . that all this agreement [in great matters] is felt as yet to give no sufficient scope for genuine, hearty, unsuspicious sympathy, from the vivid perception we have of mutual differences, on points which, if less fundamental, are unhappily felt as even more obtrusive and (in a sense) practical! . . . These differences . . . are doctrinally perhaps reducible to this question; viz. *how far does the Mediæval Church demand our unqualified sympathy?* How far may it be considered as the very same in its claims upon us with the earlier Church, as being the external exhibition of the very same spirit, changed only in that it is in a further state of growth, and that the external circumstances with which it has to cope are so widely different? And in speaking of the Mediæval Church's exhibition, we are far of course from confining our view to the mere formal statements of doctrine made at that period; we extend it to *the whole system,* which virtually received the Church's sanction: though on the other hand we may equally claim to consider that system apart from incidental, local, temporary, or popular corruptions." . . .

"It may be, that while our mind is fixed on high doctrines and primitive faith, and occupied with nothing less than our present divisions—it may be that 'God will reveal even this unto us; that *many questions connected with later ages,* may present themselves in new, and (as we shall then understand) far clearer colours. How far the special prerogatives, attached from the very first to the *Roman See,* would prepare us for the circumstance as healthy, and natural, and designed by God's Providence, that when the Church's dependence on the civil power, which succeeded to its state of depression and mutual isolation should in its turn give way to the period of its independent action, that at such time, St. Peter's chair *should obtain an unprecedented and peculiar authority:* or how far the honour (to modern notions most superstitious and extravagant) paid in early time to martyrs, marks the existence of a principle, which, when the special ages of martyrdom have passed, would display itself in honour of a different kind . . . *to Saints generally and to the Mother of God:* or how far the idea, universally

prevalent in the early Church, on some unknown suffering to be undergone between death and final bliss, would have its legitimate issue in the doctrine . . . at the time of the Council of Florence [*Purgatory*]; or what light the primitive view of *celibacy* would throw on later periods: or what light is thrown on the general question of doctrinal *development* . . . these are questions which" [depend on knowledge of Church history].[7]

In private society, however, the doctrine of development is more openly advocated, and carried out to its results. There are individuals who on this principle look on the Papal supremacy, the invocation of Saints, &c., as divinely instituted.

2. In perfect harmony with this theory, is the unwillingness to permit any censure or disapprobation of "Romish corruptions," or to allow their existence.[8] The religion of the middle ages is represented as being in essential respects superior to our own.[9] With reference to the worship of saints and angels, it is said:

"Till we not only come to believe, but in some fair measure to *realize* these solemn truths [the belief in guardian-angels, &c.], and make them part of our *habitual thoughts, of our whole spiritual nature*, we are no fair judges of their corruptions as existing in other churches. We have no wish to apologize for superstition or idolatry; but if we having only so recently recovered . . . these truths, go out of our way unnecessarily to pass judgment on their *practical action*, &c. . . . will not Matt. vii. 5 ['Thou hypocrite!' &c.] rise up against us in judgment at the last day."[1]

In another place those who profess "high church" principles are requested to abstain from severe condemnation of the mediæval system, on the following view:

[7] No. LXIV. p. 408, 409. See also LXV. p. 111. The works of Aquinas, Bonaventura, and the other schoolmen, on which the Roman theology is based, are assiduously recommended in the successive numbers of this periodical.

[8] No. LXV. p. 223. 229. [9] No. LX. p. 303; LXV. art. iv.

[1] Ib. p. 306.

"That many doctrines and practices were then sanctioned, *very alien to the system in which he* [a Churchman] *was trained, and far from congenial to his own mind*, of this such a person may be well aware; and as this is quite sufficient to guide his own practice, so surely it is all which *charity* can altogether justify him in maintaining." [2]

We are, then, to content ourselves with abstaining from what we think superstitious or idolatrous, and to permit others without warning to embrace such practices. This seems a new view of Christian charity!

3. One legitimate conclusion of the theory of development appears to be arrived at in the last number of the *British Critic*, from which it would seem that Rome *as she is* should be our actual model in religion. The class of doctrines which are included under the term "sacramental mediation," are, it seems, recognized only in theory in the Church of England, but—

"This whole view, thus distinctly recognized by our Church in theory, thus *wholly abandoned in practice*, has been preserved *abroad* in *practice*, as well as in theory. We are absolutely driven then, were we ever so averse, *to consider Rome in its degree our model*, for we are met *in limine* by objections derived from the witnessed effect of these doctrines in Roman Catholic countries." [3]

Why such objections oblige us to make Rome our *model* seems difficult to perceive. One would think that sufficient light might be derived from the practice of *antiquity*, and of the Oriental church, without constituting Rome *our model*, as is now done habitually by certain persons.

4. The last principle to which I shall direct attention is, that *Roman Catholics* may subscribe the Articles, provided they do not hold the Pope to be, *de jure*, the primate of Christendom. I do not here adduce Tract 90, because

[2] No. LXIV. p. 410. [3] No. LXVII. p. 6.

it would seem that the leading object of the writer was to show that *Catholic* doctrines—the doctrines of the Fathers and the Primitive Church, or private opinions not inconsistent with faith, are not condemned in the Articles; and I should conceive that in contending for a "Catholic," he did not mean to suggest a "*Roman* Catholic" interpretation of the Articles, though certainly some of the expositions in Tract 90 had a tendency of that kind: but other persons seem evidently to have adopted this course. The *British Critic* holds that—

"The fact seems highly probable, as a matter of history, that in the construction of the *Articles*, an eye was had to the comprehension of all *Roman Catholics except only those who maintained the Pope to be* de jure *the Primate of Christendom*."[4]

And accordingly we are informed, that—

"Mr. ——'s 'Observations on Tract 90,' and 'Collection of Testimonies,' are a very important step towards settling the question of *Catholic* subscription to the Articles. He proves historically, that the Articles were not designed to exclude *Roman Catholics*, who signed generally, without being taxed with insincerity for so doing,"[5] &c.

Those who are thus continually labouring to *write up* the Church of Rome, and to disseminate doubts and objections against the English Church, its Reformation, its doctrines, articles, liturgies, apostolical succession; those who are thus undermining in every way the Church, and preparing the way for secession from its communion—are either in doubt as to the propriety of remaining within its pale, or they are not. If they are not in doubt, they have either made up their minds that it is a matter of duty to remain in the English Church, or else to unite themselves with the Roman Communion: no other alternative can be supposed. Now let us consider

[4] No. LIX. p. 27.

[5] No. LX. p. 507.

how far the line of conduct which has been pursued by the *British Critic*, and by the individuals to whom I allude, can be justified under either of these alternatives.

1. If they are *in doubt* whether they ought to remain in the communion of the English Church or not, then it is inexcusable, nay *sinful*, to promulgate doubts and difficulties, and to assume such a tone in regard to Rome, as has a manifest tendency to unsettle faith in the Church of England, when it is still *uncertain* at least whether she is not a true Church. If it be possible that our duty is due to her, it is surely inconsistent in us to let fall a single expression which may have a tendency in the slightest degree to place a stumbling-block in the way of discharging that duty. I cannot conceive a greater pain than the feeling that we have been instrumental in raising doubts, when doubts ought not to have existed; when our own infirmity of judgment, and our own want of knowledge, were alone to blame. If any man entertain *doubts* in regard to the Church of England, he is bound in conscience to seek silently for the solution of those doubts; to cease from writing or speaking on subjects in which his own opinions are *unsettled*. No one deserves any blame for being in doubt on religious questions, unless, indeed, that doubt has arisen from too great confidence in his own powers, or from some other moral fault; but it is really inexcusable in any man, who is himself involved in the perplexities and dangers of doubts in religion, *to publish those doubts to the world*—to involve others in his own dangers and temptations.

2. If men are satisfied that it is a matter of duty to remain in the English Church, then I say, that it is wholly inconsistent with that duty to excite a spirit of doubt and dissatisfaction in the Church, and to tempt its members, in every possible way, to secede from its communion. Nothing can be more inconsistent than the practice of

disregarding its authorities, encouraging disobedience and disrespect to its prelates, and discontent with the Church itself, as if the great mass of its members were engaged in measures hostile to the true faith. It is sinful even to contemplate the possibility of voluntarily separating from the Church under circumstances of persecution or obloquy. Notions of this kind tend to diminish the horror which every Catholic should feel at the very notion of schism.

3. If there be any who are secretly convinced of the duty of uniting themselves to Rome, and who are waiting the moment to declare themselves, while in the mean time they are labouring to insinuate their own persuasion amongst the duped and blinded members of the English Church—No—I will not believe that such disgraceful and detestable treachery and hypocrisy can exist in any one who has ever partaken of sacramental privileges in the Church of England. However appearances may seem to justify such a belief, I cannot for a moment entertain the notion of such revolting iniquity:—and yet it is impossible to offer any reasonable answer to those who suspect that there are individuals who remain in the Church, only with a view to instil doctrines which would otherwise be without influence—to gather adherents who would otherwise be safe from temptation.

Under no conceivable circumstances, then, can the tone adopted by the *British Critic*, since it passed from the editorship of Mr. Newman in 1841, be excused. I confess my surprise that this periodical has so long been permitted to continue in the same course. I can only say, that I have felt it a painful duty to discontinue subscribing to it; and I sincerely hope that some change may be effected in its management, which may have the effect of relieving anxieties, and of restoring confidence in the principles of a Review, which was formerly a respectable

and useful organ of the Church of England, but which can certainly no longer justly claim that character. I deeply regret the necessity which exists for speaking thus strongly and severely. Occasional errors of judgment, such as we saw in the Tracts, may be excusable; but when the mistake is perpetuated; when it is canonized, and propagated, and multiplied from day to day, the evil becomes intolerable, and calls for the public disapprobation of Churchmen. The admission of such articles as that on "Bishop Jewell" into the *British Critic,* the tone and principles of that periodical in general, and the measures of the party which it represents, have compelled me to break silence at length, and to state my dissent from their views; and I am deeply thankful to be enabled to add, that all the advocates of Church principles with whom I have been able to communicate, concur in disclaiming the doctrines of the *British Critic.*

In dissenting from these views and principles, we are only refusing to abandon the position which all sound and consistent Churchmen have hitherto maintained. When we associated ten years since in defence of the Church of England, in vindication of her orthodox and primitive principles, we had already satisfied ourselves that this Church is justified in holding her course apart from Romish corruptions. We were not about to *settle our opinions* on such points. We were not about to put the Church of England on her trial. We were, and I trust still are, conscientiously and devotedly attached to her communion; and we have always esteemed it our glory that her belief is in accordance with *Scripture,* and with *Catholic and primitive antiquity.* The doctrine and practice of *Rome* are not our model or our standard; and we are resolved, with God's aid, to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, and to be in bondage to no man." Such, I am persuaded, are the principles of

the body of Churchmen; such seem to me to have been the principles even of the "Tracts for the Times" in general; and those who now admit the Papal supremacy, the worship of saints and angels, purgatory, and certain theories of development, really hold views as inconsistent with those Tracts, as with the sentiments of the great body of Churchmen.

I should not speak thus, had I not ascertained the sentiments of many influential friends of Church principles who have looked with pain and uneasiness on the course of events for the last two or three years. Their opinions ought no longer to be misunderstood. Their cause should no longer be mingled with doctrines and practices alien to it. It rests with them to dispel the illusion.

The *only* difficulty with which those who uphold Church principles have had to contend, is the imputation of a tendency to popery. The continual *assertion* of our opponents of all kinds has been, that Romanism is the legitimate conclusion of our principles. Romanists, Dissenters, Latitudinarians, and many others have reiterated the assertion, till the world is nearly persuaded of its truth. But what can we say—what defence can be made, when it is undeniable that Romanism, *in its very fullest extent*, has advocates amongst ourselves; that they have influence in the *British Critic;* that they are on terms of intimacy and confidence with leading men, that no public protest is entered against their proceedings by the advocates of Church principles? It is a conviction of the necessity of making some attempt, however feeble, to arrest an intolerable evil, which has induced me to publish this narrative of our proceedings, and these records of our principles and views. They are written under the apprehension that the dangers which now threaten us, are not inferior to those which surrounded

the Church in 1833; that the tendency to latitudinarianism has been replaced by a different, but not less dangerous tendency; while the spirit of disaffection to the Church has only taken a new form. It seems therefore a plain duty to hold out some warning to those who might be in danger of being deceived.

CHAPTER IV.

CHURCH PRINCIPLES STATED—DUTIES OF CHURCHMEN—PROSPECTS OF CHURCH PRINCIPLES.

Let me be permitted in this place to attempt some brief outline of Church principles, and to mark some of the principal points of distinction between those principles and certain prevalent doctrines.

During the earlier part of the present century, the Evidence of Religion, and Biblical Criticism occupied much of that attention which might have been given with greater advantage to the study of Revelation itself. With a view to obviate Infidel objections, and to render Christianity more easy of acceptance, the mysteries of Revelation had been to a certain extent explained away; its doctrines had been lowered; it had been made to approximate as closely as possible to the standard of human reason and philosophy. On the other hand, the extravagance and irregularities of Sectarianism had led many to dwell on the necessity of external regularity in the Church, without, perhaps, duly appreciating the spiritual privileges connected with visible ordinances, or seeking after that spiritual life, which the Church herself, and all her rites, gifts, and instructions, are designed to cherish and to support. And the reaction against this unconscious formalism, did not correct, to any great extent, the downward tendency of things; for while it taught us to look within and above; while it led us

beyond externals up towards the throne of God, and the cross of Jesus Christ; while it yearned for Communion with God, and was possessed of a spirit of love toward all who loved the Lord Jesus in sincerity; while it magnified Divine grace, and looked with truth on man and his works, as worthless and devoid of merit; it still aided the downward tendency of the age, by concentrating the whole of religion in the acceptance of one or two dogmas; by undervaluing the importance of the remainder of Revelation; and by overlooking the mysteries and graces of the Sacraments, in the effort after a more immediate communion with the Deity.

These remarks are not offered in any spirit of hostility or of unfriendly censure. We are sometimes inclined to judge too harshly those who have gone before us. A fair and candid consideration of the peculiar circumstances in which they were placed, and the difficulties they had to encounter, which were very different from those of the present time, will enable us, I think, to find much that was laudable in their intention, and beneficial in their agency. The defence of Christianity on rational principles; the reaction against Sectarianism; the reaction against formalism, were each valuable in its way, and to a certain extent: it was only their abuse and excess which became really injurious. On the whole, however, it is now generally admitted, that religion was not generally in a healthy state when the present theological movement commenced. Important truths had been well-nigh forgotten, or explained away. There was a tendency gradually to lose sight of some of the distinctive doctrines of Christianity and of the English Church. A dangerous spirit of Latitudinarian Reform had arisen. A self-indulgent and worldly age was endeavouring to release itself from the restraints of Conscience and Religion.

Now if such was really the case, it was a necessary consequence, that difficulties and evils should arise in the course of any attempt on the part of individuals to arrest the prevalent tendencies of things. It was impossible, when certain truths or principles had to be retrieved, that they should not apparently, and in some cases really assume an undue degree of *prominence.* Principles relating to the Church, the Sacraments, &c., were to be dwelt on continually and earnestly, if the public attention was to be arrested: and yet it was impossible to prevent many of those who became convinced of the truth of those principles, from investing them with undue importance; from supposing that the essence of religion consisted in their reception and advocacy. It hence followed as a necessary consequence, that some more earnest minds should, after a time, discover that they had not, after all, attained to the great realities of religion; that they should feel an undefined longing for some higher and more satisfying truth; that their attachment to former theories being shaken, they should enter on newer and bolder paths of speculation, and should grasp at any theory or design, which seemed to possess something of a deeper and more spiritual character, or to hold out a promise of allaying the thirst which consumed them. It was to be expected, that such minds should, after a time, unite with the opponents of Church principles in attributing *Formalism* and a want of *reality* to those principles—that they should evince a tendency to Romanism. These evils are most truly deplorable, and yet they were unavoidable, and had they been fully foreseen, ought not to have prevented the effort to restore Church principles.

But oh, how ignorant are we of, I will not say merely the *principles* (this term is too cold), but the *spirit,* the *life* of Christ's holy Church, if we for a moment suppose

that it is, in any degree, a spirit of formalism, of superstition, imagination, speculation, theory, or unreality. No; as Christians, as members of that spiritual body of Christ which is His Church, as those who are united to Him by real ties more deep and tender than human imagination can conceive; yea, "bone of His bone, and flesh of His flesh"—as Christians, I say, and members of His Church, we feel in the inmost recesses of our hearts, that it is God Himself, that Almighty Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier, who is, and ought to be, the Author, the Object, the End of our existence; that in Him we both bodily and spiritually "live, and move, and have our being," that He must be to us, "all in all," that virtuous actions, religious worship, the sacraments and means of Grace, the Ministry, the Church, Revelation itself, are only valuable because they are creations of His power, instruments of His will, conducive to union with Him; that He is the only and Eternal Fountain, from whence all spiritual things derive their vitality; and that while we drink of that inexhaustible fountain we shall "*never thirst;*" we have within us "a well of water springing up into eternal life." And where this is not the habit of the soul; where GOD is not the sum and substance of existence, the heart will be ever unsatisfied and restless, and devoid of true peace. The exercises of external devotion — ritual observances — the sacraments — the Church—the strictest external discipline—inward mortifications, and even monastic seclusion, may still leave the soul without its only solid consolation—its only adequate object. If we are restless and dissatisfied, it is because we attempt to repose our hopes on *inferior objects*, whether good or evil.

And it is from this principle alone—this absolute consciousness that God Himself is our "life," and our "hope," that all spiritual obedience, and the whole life

of Christianity emanate. It is because we feel our natural state of danger, and our utter dependence on Him, that we avail ourselves of every possible means of grace, and feel true happiness only in conforming ourselves to the intimations of the Divine will, and thus preserving a continual union with the Deity.

It is then no mere dry and speculative principle on which the orthodox Christian acts, in receiving with the deepest veneration the holy Scripture. He receives it as THE WORD OF GOD—the only undoubted declaration of His will—a declaration mercifully vouchsafed for our salvation, and therefore full and ample, and in no respect deficient, as the Catholic Fathers have unanimously taught. And consequently he disapproves of any tendency to undervalue Scripture, to discourage its circulation or perusal, or to represent it as insufficient to establish the great doctrines of the faith; knowing that the most eminent defenders of the doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation, and other articles of the true faith, have always relied on Scripture as their strongest support. On the other hand, it is impossible to approve that *exclusive* veneration of Scripture, which would virtually supersede the office of the Christian ministry, and which, combined as it frequently is, with an assertion of the unlimited right of private interpretation, unguided by the instructions of the existing Church, and wholly independent of the recorded sentiments and tradition of the whole body of believers from the beginning, has a tendency to permit each individual to substitute his *own view* of revelation, for belief in revealed truth itself. It should never be forgotten that Scripture is the *inestimable*, but not the *only* gift of God.

In the same spirit we should confess the blessed privileges of the Sacraments; not like some, viewing them as mere signs of our duties or our privileges, instituted

merely for the purpose of stimulating our faith; but recognizing in them communications of Divine Grace, means of communion with God; and therefore most deeply feeling the necessity of availing ourselves of such blessed gifts. Nor can any words be too high, when we speak of that regenerating Grace, which in holy baptism transforms the child of Adam's sin into the child of God; which clothes him with righteousness, engrafts him into the body of Christ, enables him to lay hold on the salvation set before him, and through "faith working by love" to attain eternal glory. And this divine life, thus implanted in the soul, is, we believe, sustained and nourished by innumerable graces and dispensations of the Holy Spirit, but more especially in the sacrament of the holy Communion, in which, by a mystery beyond human comprehension, the blessed Jesus Himself becomes the true nourishment and food of our souls, condescending to enter our earthly tabernacles, that He may make us partakers of Himself, and afford to our flesh a pledge of immortality. In all this God Himself should be our immediate object and end. The Sacraments (I speak now only of those great mysteries generally necessary to salvation) are only precious, as links which bind us to our Creator and to the Eternal Son which is the Word of God; but in this point of view they are awful and inestimable gifts; and we, therefore, can as little approve of those who venture to undervalue such gifts, to divest them of their graces, to explain away their high mysteries, as we can of others, who in their attempt to attain clearer views of the mystery of the Eucharist, involve themselves in contradiction to the plain words of Scripture by the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and needlessly, perhaps dangerously, compel men to distrust the evidence of their senses. Nor can we in any degree approve of any system or theory which tends to the reception of a doctrine so unfounded, and connected with such a mass of super-

stitions. In Romanism the sacrament becomes little else than a sacrifice; it is rather something which we offer to God, than something which God confers on us. The sacrificial character of the Eucharist, in a sense which is most dangerous and even heretical (as not merely a spiritual sacrifice of praise and commemoration, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ, but as the sacrifice of Jesus Christ Himself for the remission of sins), is habitually dwelt upon, apparently with a view to salve the conscience of those who "*assist*" at this sacrifice, while they refuse to partake of the divine gifts of the body and blood of our Redeemer which are there offered. Thus, an unspeakable grace of God is rejected, while man identifies his lowly and unworthy offering with that stupendous sacrifice which was sufficient to redeem the whole universe.

With reference to the Church, we should maintain such principles as these. The association of the disciples of Jesus Christ in His holy Church, and their instruction and guidance by a ministry commissioned from on High through the apostles, for their sacred work, are divinely-appointed and ordinary conditions of our salvation. We would cherish them as such; not regarding them merely as privileges or advantages vouchsafed to us for *our merits*, or of which we have any right to *boast*, and still less declaiming in any uncharitable spirit against those who may be deprived of such blessings, even through their own fault; but feeling it as a deeply important practical truth, that there *are* such conditions, and that we are bound to avail ourselves of them. The Church, the ministry, and the legitimate succession of one and the other, are then of infinite importance to us; not in themselves, but as institutions of God, which we dare not neglect, and which we are bound to cherish as evidences of His paternal care.

We would, therefore, deprecate all views on this sub-

ject which tend to dissolve the obligation of Christian unity in the Church, to represent it as a merely human institution, or to deny to its ministers that divine commission which alone authorizes them to undertake so great an office. But on the other hand, we would with equal earnestness deprecate theories of a contrary tendency, which have emanated from some influence alien to the spirit of religion. We would disclaim that fanciful theory of an absolute external unity; of a perfect sanctity; of an unblemished purity in doctrine and discipline, with which Romanism has deceived itself, and which some amongst ourselves seem willing to adopt. It is evident from the Bible and the annals of Christianity, that the Church is symbolized by its vital members; that infirmities, sins, and corruptions, are found in it—that it is at one time more pure than at another; at one time more animated by faith and charity than at another—and yet that God is still directing and guiding it amidst many infirmities and backslidings, and sometimes, notwithstanding grievous sins; still urging it onwards, and accomplishing His promise, that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." We see this in the tare-sown field, the draught of fishes, the predictions of false teachers, and of heresies privily brought in.

And therefore we would not venture to maintain, in opposition to the plainest evidence of Holy Scripture and of Christian antiquity, that certain doctrines and practices which obtained extensively in the middle ages, and which are still received in the Church of Rome, must *necessarily* be sound and healthy, and in accordance with the spirit of the Gospel. We cannot, on such a theory, set aside the plain and undeniable *evidence,* which is opposed to the Invocation and Worship of Saints and Angels, of images and relics. We cannot conceal the denunciations of God against idolatry in every shape; nor can we

sanction any sort of religious worship to created beings. Even though such worship may not be always in *theory* or in *intention* idolatrous (most assuredly it is often idolatrous even in *theory*), yet, still, if it has a direct tendency to idolatry; to withdraw man from his allegiance to his Creator; then woe be to us if we in any degree countenance or approve what is so deeply offensive to a "JEALOUS GOD." I mean not to say that all who have practised these things were idolaters: God forbid. We may find excuses for many of those who in ancient or modern times have done so. They acted thus from want of knowledge or of consideration; those doctrines and practices had not "developed" themselves; distinctions were made, and interpretations received, which in many cases saved men from the guilt of idolatry. But if those who have seen the evils attendant on such things; if they who have escaped the pollutions of the world, "are again entangled therein and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning." It is not our place to draw nice distinctions, and to measure how near we may approach to idolatry. Such is not the service with which God will be contented. If we be faithful to Him, we must not fear, in defence of His truth, and in a holy jealousy for the Lord God of Hosts, to uplift our voice like a trumpet, and to warn and exhort, against any concession on points so essential to the purity, nay, to the *existence* of religion.

And again; while we uphold the undoubted truth, that God has given to us a Ministry invested with authority to preach the Gospel, and to administer the Sacraments, and ecclesiastical discipline; while we believe that the chief pastors of the Church have succeeded to the ministry of the Apostles; that great reverence is due to their admonitions and decisions; that we are bound to "esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake;"

to pray without ceasing for the success of their apostolical ministry; and to render their task more easy by our obedience and humbleness of mind:—while we thus uphold the sacred mission of the Ambassadors of Jesus Christ, we are, I hope, equally prepared to reprove any assumptions which owe their origin to an unholy desire for the "pre-eminence"—any power which is based on usurpation; which devoid, as it is, of any Divine or Apostolical institution, assumes to be possessed of both, and arrogates the government of the whole world both in temporals and spirituals. We can never, for any reason, or with any view whatever, give way to the claims of the Papacy; and we cannot but marvel most exceedingly, that any persons professing to be members of the English Church, can be so deceived and blinded by the shallow sophistries of the modern advocates of Rome, as to be ready, not merely to admit the Papal supremacy, but to admit it in all the wildest extravagance of its assumptions and claims.

Of the doctrines of Satisfaction, Indulgences, and Purgatory, we can never approve, based as they are on a principle which strikes at the root of our confidence in the promises of God; the assumption, that the sins of those who truly repent are not wholly forgiven; that penalties are still to be endured; that the wrath and justice of God is still to be appeased. We condemn the system of indulgences which subverted the discipline of the Church, and which is applied to the support of innumerable superstitions. We condemn the doctrine of Purgatory, which supposes the justified to endure, after this life, tortures and sufferings inflicted by the justice of God. We cannot approve of lying wonders, legends, miraculous images, and the mass of superstitions which deform and degrade the popular religion of Rome; nor can we avoid looking with jealousy and dissatisfaction

on any attempts to reconcile the public mind to such abuses.

No: this is not the mode in which the union of the Universal Church can be attained. It is not by concessions on vital points; it is not by evincing a disposition to give way to claims, doctrines, and practices, which intelligent Romanists themselves disapprove; it is not by sacrificing the truth of the Gospel and Christian liberty in a vain and hopeless straining after a communion, which God, for His own wise purposes, has permitted to be interrupted; it is not *thus* that the breaches of the Church can be—*ought* to be, repaired. When we shall see in *other* Churches, as well as in our own, a spirit of improvement, a spirit of humility and moderation; when their members shall have gained the Christian courage to avow and to reform the abuses of which thousands and tens of thousands of them are secretly conscious; when superstition and idolatry are not, as now, gaining ground, but receding; when the Papal power, and ultramontane principles are not, as now, increasing, but diminishing; then, but not till then, may we hope and trust that the reunion of the Church is at hand. In the mean time it behoves us to take heed to *ourselves*, and with a thankful sense of the spiritual privileges which God hath vouchsafed to this branch of His holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, with a sense of our deficiencies, and an earnest desire to correct them; to stand firm in the old paths, rooted and grounded in the faith, not carried about with every wind of doctrine, but, in a humble reliance on Divine assistance, going on unto perfection. We shall thus have delivered our own souls, and shall have glorified God in this branch of His Church on earth.

Let me now be permitted to turn to some other subjects, which are of considerable practical importance at the present time. And in the first place, I would

invite attention to the difficult question, how far, and under what limitations should members of the Church of England *admit defects in her existing system.*

It may be argued, that true filial piety, and zeal for the interests of Religion oblige us to desire and labour for the amendment of defects, and that it is only by pointing out those defects, that the public mind can be awakened to a sense of their existence. Be it so; but then much, nay, everything depends on the *mode* in which such a movement is conducted. In the first place, men ought to be very careful, that the defects pointed out should be *real* and *proved* defects. It is not because this or that individual is of opinion that the revival of certain rites, or the introduction of certain practices would be conducive to edification, that he has any right to infer that the Church has not good reasons for her existing practice, or that she is in any degree deficient, because they are not recommended by authority. He should remember, that what might be conducive to his own edification, might be to another, "destruction." He should reflect, that the rulers of the Church, in times when there was *a more practical and experimental knowledge* of the working of another system than there can be now, must have had better opportunities of judging of the tendencies of that system by its actual operation on their own minds than we can have; and that we may now be totally unable, under any circumstances, even by forsaking the communion of the Church, to place ourselves really in their position, or to comprehend fully the working of the system which they reformed. So that in fact, what men regard as deficiencies, may be only the results of most pious care, most practical wisdom, most holy jealousy. If such men would as *candidly* endeavour to place themselves in the position of the Reformers, and to comprehend their leading principles

and motives, as they do to enter into the views and feelings of Roman Catholics; they would, I am sure, feel more satisfaction at the great work which was accomplished in the sixteenth century.

It is not by implicitly receiving the views of modern apologists of the Mediæval system (such as Mr. Digby), and by dwelling only on its brighter and more engaging aspect, that such knowledge can be attained, as is calculated to enable men to judge rightly and fairly of the Reformation. Such a mode of investigation is pre-eminently liable to the imputation of *unreality:* the Mediæval system is thus viewed merely as a theory; its real nature is unknown.

We should then be very careful only to point out real and *proved* defects in the Church; but here again, more especially under existing circumstances, there must be some further caution. Nothing can be more injurious and dangerous than the prevalent habit of pointing out defects, apparently *without any definite object;* but in a mere spirit of *complaining.* This habit cannot fail to render men *discontented* with the Church, disposed to schism, and to dangerous innovations. It causes infinite scandal to the weaker brethren, and throws many men back on existing systems as affording the only refuge against a spirit of spiritual turbulence and disloyalty. To so great a length has this evil proceeded, that beardless youths and young women discuss without scruple the most solemn and difficult subjects of controversy; and presume to censure the Church; to condemn her existing system; to canvass and to blame the conduct and principles of those who sit in the chairs of the Apostles. This is an abuse which demands the interference of parents, instructors, and the clergy generally.

There are those, however, to whom years, and attainments, and station, give some right to investigate defects,

and to attempt their removal. But they will, I am sure, act most wisely, when they endeavour *never to point out a defect without suggesting, at the same time, a feasible remedy.* If this be done, the Church will be encouraged and stimulated by the hope of improvement, instead of being left to mourn in spiritless despondency over her faults.

I must now bring these observations to a close. It has been freely admitted that there have been faults on the part of the writers of the "Tracts for the Times:" there has been, on the other hand, much to lament in the conduct of those who have risen in opposition to the "Tracts for the Times." I am persuaded—I know indeed, that amongst those whose disapprobation of the Tracts has been publicly avowed, many, very many, deeply regret the *tone* in which the controversy has been too frequently carried on.[1] The *Record* (a journal which was subject to *presbyterian* influence) was the first to adopt this tone; it was followed by the *Christian Observer*, and subsequently by various other periodicals, and by innumerable pamphlets and other works written in a spirit which it is most painful to remember. May we never be brought into judgment for these ebullitions of an ill-regulated zeal, in which charity and decency were too

[1] I cannot but lament the tone adopted by some highly respected prelates on this subject. The language employed by the Bishop of Chester, and by the Metropolitan of Calcutta, in their charges, seems to me calculated to give countenance to a spirit which has been most injurious to the Church. The respect which is due to the abilities and Christian zeal of those prelates, evinced by their great exertions in the cause of Christianity within their respective spheres, only adds to the regret which their controversial tone has excited. Two or three other Prelates might be mentioned, whose words seem not to have been always guided by that spirit of wisdom and charity which their eminent station demands, and which has been happily manifested by the great body of our prelacy.

frequently altogether lost sight of. Party feeling has led to every species of unfairness. Exaggeration of facts has almost universally prevailed; motives have been unjustly imputed; character has been traduced; extremes of doctrine, or mistakes in practice have sometimes led to contrary extremes. I will not further pursue this grievous subject, and shall only add a most earnest and respectful prayer, that all sincere friends of the Church, who may disapprove of the doctrines or theories advanced in the theological system of the Tracts, may feel the necessity of repressing intemperate language, personal reflections, everything calculated to irritate without convincing. It would be wholly impossible under existing circumstances to expect that *controversy* on such points should be discontinued. The sacred interests of Christian truth would not permit the slightest relaxation in that conscientious vigilance which has been exercised, or in the duty of "contending *earnestly* for the faith once delivered to the saints." It may even be necessary to introduce controversial subjects *occasionally* in the pulpit, when congregations seem to be in special danger from the approach of error. But where there is no such danger; where there is enough and more than enough of hostility to certain unpopular doctrines, and to their advocates, it is surely unwise to excite and disturb congregations by *continual* appeals on controversial subjects. The frequent application of such stimulants must tend to create a tone of mind very injurious to practical and spiritual religion, to promote divisions already but too serious, and to foster a spirit of criticism, which may at any moment re-act on those who have been instrumental in drawing it forth, and may create for them embarrassments of the most serious nature.

I would also venture to suggest (and the suggestion is offered alike to all parties) the necessity of abstaining

from the perusal of controversial writings, and especially from the study of journals and periodicals, *the circulation of which depends on the amount of excitement which they supply.* I am persuaded, that no one who permits himself the habitual study of such publications, can fail of imbibing their tone, and of thus being gradually filled with irritated and angry feeling. I am sure that many excellent men would have recoiled with horror from the perusal of such writings, had they been aware of the frame of mind to which they were about to be unconsciously led. It almost seems to argue distrust in the soundness of a cause, when we are for ever seeking for arguments to sustain it. If "Tractarianism," as it is sometimes called, be dangerous and pernicious—if it has been marked by censures, why is it necessary to dwell longer on the subject? Is it wise or right to continue the controversy, to the exclusion of almost every other thought or interest; to mark all its turns and windings, to listen to every alleged error, and dwell on every alleged instance of folly or of guilt? Do not such studies tend to disturb the heart, and disqualify it from the higher pursuits of religion? Do they not engender a spirit of criticism? Are they wholly exempt from *danger,* in familiarizing the mind with the notions of error and evil? I am convinced that there is no more clear duty of Christians in these days, than that of abstaining from the *habitual* study of controversial journals and periodicals, in which the power of writing *anonymously* what no man would venture openly to avow; and the pecuniary interests of publishers or proprietors, which are promoted by violence of tone and party spirit, combine to keep up an unwholesome and unnatural excitement. And I would most earnestly and humbly appeal to the consciences of writers in periodicals, whether it is right to put forward sentiments under the veil of anonymous communications, which they would

feel in any degree reluctant to publish with their names. Individuals have it in their power largely to diminish these evils, and in that power is involved responsibility—a responsibility to God for the welfare of His Church. With reference to publishers, I cannot but observe, that they are, and ought to be held *responsible*, to a certain extent, for the works which they are instrumental in bringing before the public. They have not apparently been sufficiently alive to this responsibility. Much has been published of late which should never have made its appearance. The Church has, in a great degree, the remedy in her own hands. If publishers are in future so forgetful of their responsibility as to print indiscriminately all that is offered to them; if they thus prove themselves careless of the interests of the Church, let them know the opinions of her members: let authors and purchasers withdraw their patronage and support.

More especially would I venture to offer a word of caution, in regard to parties which have been brought into this controversy. Churchmen ought surely to be able to settle their own differences without calling in the aid of Dissenters or of Romanists. It may be that these strangers to the Church speak truly on some of the disputed points; but, however this may be, I cannot but think it highly derogatory to the dignity of truth to receive the aid of such auxiliaries; and when it is remembered, as it ought to be, that the parties in quèstion are actuated by the most unremitting hostility to the Church; that their craft is equal to their hostility; that their obvious policy is to excite jealousies and divisions in the Church to the very utmost, in the hopes of detaching at some favourable crisis the more excited of its members, and of uniting them to their own parties respectively; seeing all this, I cannot but think it almost suicidal, to avail ourselves of the assistance so eagerly

proffered by Romanists and Dissenters, and to give them the satifaction of witnessing the progress of their designs.

In conclusion, let us consider the present state and prospects of Church principles. There are some adherents of these principles, I am aware, who are inclined to look rather despondingly on the prospects of the truth. The violent opposition which has been raised against the Tracts and other connected publications, and against their authors; the unpopularity of some important principles; the discouragement given by politicians of all parties;[2] the censures passed by so many prelates; the particular acts of censure under which the leaders of the Tract theology have been silenced or condemned; the outcry for further victims daily stimulated by party journals, all combine to dispirit, to alarm, to alienate some minds from the English Church, as though it would be impossible to continue much longer in the profession of truth within her bosom. To some, perhaps, it seems doubtful, whether that Church can be indeed a Christian and a Catholic Church, when she permits truth to be so violently assailed and oppressed.

Such thoughts are passing in the hearts of some brethren; but I think that there is another view of the circumstances in which we are placed, which is at once more reasonable and more encouraging. Admitting, then, most unreservedly, the fact, that opposition *does* exist on questions of great moment; that essential truths have been, in fact, contradicted; still it remains to be inquired, how far that opposition arises from misconception or not, and how great is its real amount. If we do not

[2] I may be permitted to observe, that after the publication of such articles as that "on the Tamworth Reading-room," in the *British Critic*, we can feel very little surprise at the evident hostility of an influential party [Peel and his friends.]

consider the real *causes* and *direction* of existing prejudices, it will be impossible to comprehend their bearing on the question of Church principles.

It appears to me, then, that the prejudice, the opposition, the persecution of which we have to complain were caused in some degree by indiscretions. Doubtless we should have had a great amount of obloquy to encounter under any circumstances; doubtless there would have been suspicions, artifices, and very much of what we have had to deplore. But had not opponents been given *every conceivable advantage* by offensive expressions, inconsiderate language, unwise acts, the opposition could never have become formidable. It was in order to prevent such evils that I vainly endeavoured to obtain *revision* of the Tracts, that I even laboured for their suppression. I was anxious to see this *practical* application of the doctrine of reserve and *οἰκονομία*. I was earnest that advantages should not be given to opponents; that the public mind should not be offended by the mode in which truth was presented to its notice. Had this sincere advice, which was probably, at the time, regarded as a sort of compromising expediency, been acted on, I cannot but think that much evil and danger would have been avoided.

I am far from presuming to blame those friends who adopted a contrary course: but it certainly does seem that the opposition which has been gradually swelling into louder and more vehement wrath, was excited to some extent by *mere indiscretion—mere excesses;* that it is directed, and will be directed, not so much against Church principles, as against certain mistakes, and against principles which we cannot approve; being chiefly directed against those Romanizing tendencies which we most strongly repudiate; and I cannot but cherish the opinion and the hope, that there is no indis-

position in the public mind to afford a fair consideration to Church principles, if they are not urged in such a form and mode as is extremely, and, to a certain extent, justly obnoxious; and I confidently trust that the doctrines of Bancroft and Andrewes, Bramhall and Taylor, Hammond and Beveridge, Bull and Wilson; the doctrines of antiquity, of our formularies, and of the Scripture itself, will finally obtain that universal approbation and acceptance to which they are most justly entitled. I would not for a moment deny the fact, that there are parties who are very unsound in their belief, and who are on principle opposed to sound and Catholic views. I have not the least hope of conciliating such men, nor would I make any concession to them; but they have obtained an influence which would have been unattainable, had not many indiscretions been committed, and had not certain writers, within the last two years, manifested Romanizing tendencies.

What, in fact, are the principles and the conduct against which so much vehement opposition has been raised, and which the prelates have found it necessary to censure or oppose? I am persuaded that the great body of those who adhere to Church principles[3] will, on consideration, agree with me, that they are not bound to vindicate the points which have been thus objected to. The very laudatory terms in which Romanism has been spoken of, is one great cause of offence. We are surely not bound to employ such terms, or to approve their use. The depreciating manner in which the English Church

[3] Let me not be supposed for a moment to imply that *Church principles* are limited to those who approve of the "Tracts for the Times." I know, and thankfully acknowledge, that many of their opponents have always maintained sound and Catholic principles. The Church is far, very far, more united in great points than it might be imagined.

has been mentioned, the abuse of her Reformers, the spirit of discontent with her offices, the desire to alter and assimilate her system to that of Rome,—all this has been another principal ground of offence. Churchmen are certainly not obliged to adopt any such course; they are not to consider their principles as censured or condemned when such things are objected to. The hostility against notions of tradition, which would either supersede Scripture or receive articles of faith not contained therein, does not seem directed against the sober and rational view, which receives the testimony of the primitive Fathers, of the Creeds, of the Universal Church in all ages, as confirmatory of that view of Scripture which the Church of England entertains, in opposition to the errors of Unitarians, Latitudinarians, Dissenters, Romanists. I need not proceed further on this topic: other instances will readily suggest themselves.

However distressing may be our present differences, yet we should remember that the Church is at all times liable to the recurrence of such difficulties, which are frequently of long continuance. The history of *Jansenism* will show that the Roman Church has not been able to prevent protracted discussions within her own bosom.

In our own Church differences on certain points of doctrine, which are now in dispute, were, *thirty years ago*, as hotly and vehemently carried on as they are at the present day. Do not let us suppose that theological differences on justification, grace, the influence of the sacraments, and other connected points, are ever likely to come to an end in the Church. Candour and charity may lead us to acknowledge the excellence of many who hold contrary views on these subjects, and to walk in Christian communion with them; but perfect agreement is perhaps unattainable in this world of imperfection.

In conclusion, it is impossible not to advert in a spirit of deep thankfulness to the prospects of the Church, and the progress of Christian principles and practice. Who shall say that much has not been done within the last ten years? And what may we not humbly expect from the blessing of God on patient, and humble, and persevering endeavours for personal and general improvement? A theology deepened and invigorated; a Church daily awakening more and more to a sense of her privileges and responsibilities; a Clergy more zealous, more self-denying, more holy; a laity more interested in the great concerns of time and eternity; Churches more fully attended; sacraments and divine offices more frequently and fervently partaken; unexampled efforts to evangelize the multitudinous population of our land, and to carry the word of God into the dark recesses of heathenism. In all this there is very much to awaken our hopes, and to stimulate to continued exertions. Lethargy and indifference, at least, are at an end. We are conscious of our deficiencies, and not ashamed to own them; and God forbid that we should ever cease to be so; or that the effort and straining forward towards greater purity, and sanctity, and discipline, should ever lose one particle of its energy. No sincere friend of the Church; no zealous and faithful servant of Jesus Christ could wish to impose any restraint or check on the desire for improvement. He cannot but rejoice at the existence of such a spirit, and unite himself cordially to its praiseworthy efforts. He will be very careful not to damp the kindling fervour of devotion and self-denial; or to restrain the efforts to restore ecclesiastical discipline. He will be careful, as far as in him lies, that weak and wavering minds shall not be alienated by any apparent want of zeal on his part; any apparent indifference to spiritual things; any forgetfulness or compromise of great Catholic principles.

We have much to hope, should Divine Providence mercifully guide us in this course. It is thus that we shall best promote the cause of Catholic unity throughout the whole world. But we are undoubtedly surrounded with difficulties and dangers; and *absolute ruin* may be brought on us by the exaggerations and mistakes of a few men. The bright prospects before us may be blotted out for ever, if there be any *reasonable* suspicion of Romish tendencies; if there be not most frank, and honest, and open dealing on this subject. Let the public mind once be so deeply deceived, as to suppose that the advocates of Church principles have any concealed designs in favour of Romanism; any partiality for that evil system; any wish to promote the revival of that system; any desire whatever, beyond that of reinvigorating the Church in strict harmony with her own genuine principles, and according to the model of the pure and *primitive* ages: let mistakes on this subject be assiduously instilled by hostile malignity, and permitted to prevail through any weakness, timidity, or reserve on our part, and the result can be nothing but *ruin;* ruin to sound principles; destruction to all hopes of improvement; annihilation to all possibility of ever restoring Catholic unity; division, and remorse within the Church; and perhaps the final triumph of the principles of anarchy in religion and politics.

Such evils can, and (under the Divine blessing) *will*, I hope, be averted from us. But there are great and mighty interests depending on the conduct even of *individuals* amongst us. Unguarded words, thoughtless actions, notions put forth almost in playfulness, may have deep consequences. They may be recorded as amongst our most weighty sins at the last day. A child may, in his sport, apply a match to a barrel of gunpowder. An indiscreet word may open the floodgates of schism or

heresy. May we earnestly supplicate Divine grace to guide our words with discretion and moderation; and to enable us to pursue our difficult and anxious path, without swerving to the right hand or the left, and without leading any astray from the fold of Him, "who is the Shepherd and Bishop of our souls."

I have now to express an earnest hope, that an indulgent and favourable construction will be extended by the Christian reader to this little work. Its object is not to add to our divisions, or to create unkindly feeling in any quarter; but to offer some warning which seems greatly needed at the present time; and to obviate mistakes which might have a most injurious effect on the cause of truth. It will not, I trust, tend to *division*, if it should have proved, that those who advocate Church principles are not unwilling to acknowledge faults where they really exist, and to act in entire freedom from party feeling. And, on the other hand, I would hope, that if a line has been drawn between our principles and the theories which a few brethren have recently advanced, a difference which exists *in reality*, and which I have not brought into existence, will not be *increased*. And with reference to the eminent men who have patiently endured much obloquy and discouragement, and whom I hope always to consider as friends, it will perhaps be not without use to have shown the simplicity and rectitude of their intentions in originating this movement; and for this cause, I am content to take share in a responsibility which has hitherto not been attributed to me. I humbly trust that our hands and hearts were pure in this matter—that we have nothing to conceal—nothing of which we need be ashamed—nothing for which we are not prepared, in reliance on the merits of Jesus Christ, to render an account at the LAST GREAT DAY. There was no dishonesty on our part—no wish to promote Romanism—no dis-

loyalty to the Church of England—no want of charity towards any of her members—no design, except that of seeing all the principles of the English Church in full and active operation—no wish, but that of promoting the glory of God, "and on earth peace, goodwill towards men." But we were "compassed with infirmity," were "men of like passions with you;" and therefore were liable to error and indiscretion. I think that any indiscretions and mistakes which have been committed, have been far too harshly judged; and while I would not impute any *intentional* injustice to those who have combined circumstances which had in reality no connexion, and have deduced from them a proof of some design on our part to promote the cause of Romanism, I must say, that such a charge is really and substantially unjust.

APPENDIX.

NOTE A.

Amongst the most gratifying and encouraging circumstances of that time was the affectionate zeal manifested by many Lay-members of the Church. I subjoin an extract from a letter which conveys the sentiments of one whose character, still more exalted than his rank, had obtained for him the admiration of all sincere friends of the Church.

FROM A CLERGYMAN.

R——, Nov. 8th, 1833.

On consulting with the Dean, and other warm friends of the Association, I find it is their unanimous opinion, and in which I agree with them, that our wisest course in this neighbourhood is to confine ourselves for the present to the circulation of the "Suggestions," and to getting the adhesion of all we can, both Clergy and Laity, to the general principles there laid down[1] .... The Dean has received answers from the Duke [of Buckingham], and the Bishop of ——, quite in character with the individuals, the purport of which I shall subjoin. . . . The following is the purport of the Duke's :—

> "My dear Sir,—I am always disposed to attend to your recommendations, but on the present occasion particularly so, agreeing, as you know I do, most anxiously and warmly in the views which are so spiritedly and wisely exhibited in the Prospectus which you enclosed to me. I am quite disposed to give my name to the Association, and I gladly commission you

[1] Some difficulties had already arisen with regard to the "Tracts for the Times."

to use it as you please in the defence of the Church, where the purposes are sound and pure, and the defence well-judged and courageous. My services, whatever they may be worth, are at the feet of the Church, as the most Christian form of worship, and inculcating the purest religion of any known faith. My life or death are wholly at the service of such a cause; only be true to yourselves, and I trust that no danger or difficulty will ever appal me, or deter me from meeting your enemies, and contending for the belief which must bless and consecrate any country that cherishes and upholds it.

"I most completely subscribe to the two 'Objects,' and as to the last paragraph of the 'Suggestions' beginning 'They feel strongly,' it delights me to read it; it is the cardinal point, and I have always said, that if it had hitherto been acted upon, we should not now be where we are, in a state of anarchy, and almost in a republic of religion. Pray let me hear more about this, as more may arise."

This is noble .... I shall be very glad to find that the Bishop's information[2] is correct; but we must not relax our endeavours to organize the whole body of Churchmen to support the Bishops, if they manfully perform their duty, and to step into the breach if they desert their posts.

The sentiments of an eminent writer on that crisis, which are conveyed in the following extracts, will be read with interest.

FROM A CLERGYMAN.

—— *Ripon, Nov.* 4, 1833.

Mrs. —— has called this moment, and left me a letter from Southey [the poet], an extract from which I shall subjoin. She suggests that you should write to him on the subject. He takes a melancholy view of the subject, though I believe a just one; but if we can effect no more than he supposes, we shall be amply repaid for our exertions. If the Association is carried on with the same good sense and prudence with which it has begun, it will be a tower of strength to the Church:—

[2] A contradiction of the report of the intention of the government to make latitudinarian alterations in the Liturgy.

Extract from Mr. Southey's Letter.

"I have put Mr. ——'s papers in circulation. The 'Suggestions' are drawn up with great judgment, and the objects stated so unexceptionable, that no person who is verily and essentially a Churchman could object to them. No person can concur more heartily than myself in the opinion and principles there expressed; but I do not perceive how such an Association is to act, and what can be effected by it. Can it do anything more than petitiou King, Lords, and Commons, against a destructive system which King and Commons are bent upon pursuing, and which the Lords are too weak to resist? They may indeed circulate pamphlets and insert wholesome letters in the newspapers, and this will be doing much eventual good: it is not likely that it should avert the evils that are intended, but certainly it will prepare the way for a reaction and a restoration."

I subjoin extracts from a correspondence which took place about this time, which will throw some light on the principles on which the Association was based.

TO A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT.

Oxford, November 12th, 1833.

I take the liberty of forwarding to you, as a tried and proved friend of the Church, the prospectus entitled "Suggestions," &c. of an Association or system of correspondence and co-operation which is rapidly progressing in almost every part of England. Our principles you will see in the Prospectus. Our plan is to establish an extensive correspondence with those who agree with us in principle, and to induce them, by means of the Prospectus, to unite and co-operate with the clergy and laity in their respective neighbourhoods. This will enable them to encourage each other, and to give expression to their feelings in a combined form, if any attempt should be made to injure our religion, more especially by introducing latitudinarian changes in our Liturgy and other standards of faith. Amongst our friends are . . . . . We are in correspondence with nearly forty counties, in which we have numerous friends among the laity and clergy . . . . We are now engaged in getting up an Address from the Clergy to the Primate, a copy of which I send you. It will help to unite and to raise the

spirits of our friends. It is intended to follow it up by an Address from the Laity, expressive of their attachment for the religion of their forefathers; and if those who sign the former address, exert themselves properly in their parishes, with the aid of our lay friends I do not see why there should not be a most powerful demonstration. We want the laity to join us in defence of their own Church, and not to leave the clergy alone to fight the battle of Religion against Infidelity, Popery, and Dissent. If we could get our clergy and laity to unite, on strong religious principle, such as is contained in the Prospectus, the results might be most happy; for I believe that it only wants that we should *bestir* ourselves, to show *who* has the real strength and influence. I believe we shall not in the Association want for ardour and zeal, at least if I may judge by what has hitherto come under my observation. [W. Palmer.]

REPLY TO THE ABOVE.

——, *Westminster*, 13*th Nov.*, 1833.

. . . I wish to ask thus privately, whether there be, in any of the Tracts published by the Association to which you refer, or by its leading members, any desire to dissolve the remaining connexion between the Church and the State. I have heard that one individual, whose name you have given among the supporters of the plan, has been exerting himself in this way—how far the information may be correct, even as to him individually, I know not, for I have not yet seen any of his later works; how far it may appear in the Tracts of the Association, I know as little, because, though I have been favoured with them, I have not been in the house in which they are, in the country, long enough to open them; but I own that I am very anxious to find that I have been misinformed . . . .

TO THE SAME.

Oxford, Nov. 14*th*, 1833.

I feel it due to your interest in our proceedings to enter into the fullest and most confidential detail on the subjects to which you allude. Our plan originally was to promote as far as was in our power Church principles, and to defend the doctrines of the Church of England in these days of latitudinarian indifference. We united with this object, and issued the Prospectus you have seen. Some anonymous Tracts were also written by various persons, and circulated among our friends as the works of individuals, and not

authorized by the Association. They were not in fact intended to be the Tracts of the Association, but they were not unnaturally confounded with it, and as they have been disapproved of by many, we have discontinued circulating them. [The author at this time believed that the Tracts were suspended.] I beg to observe, however, that I am not aware of anything in these Tracts tending to separate Church and State, and so far from there being the least intention of the kind among our leading friends,[3] I know that they are most strong supporters of the union. It is true, that two or three excellent individuals may go rather far on this subject (I will in the strictest confidence mention Mr. —, Mr. —, and Mr. —,) but at the same time you will recollect that it is impossible but that there must be varieties of opinion amongst the individuals of a large Association, . . . and they are not, I may add, our most influential members. Circumstances, indeed, render it impossible that they should take a leading part.

With regard to the Address, I am happy to say that it meets the approbation of the Clergy generally; and you will observe, that while the third paragraph does certainly leave the door open to improvement, it is only *such* improvement as the Archbishop proposes, and as is consistent with our principles previously stated. Had the Address been put forward without this paragraph, I believe the Clergy would not generally have signed it, and we might have been said to be opposed *in limine* to all improvement, while the Primate would not have received the support of such an Address, and our friends would have been divided.

Pardon the length of this explanation. We want to unite all the Church, orthodox and evangelical, clergy, nobility, and people, in maintenance of our doctrine and polity; and standing UNITED once again on this strong religious ground, and co-operating with the Primate and Bishops, with the advice of laymen like yourself, we may surely accomplish much. The Church of England gives us all unity; and it is a topic that will find its way to the hearts of our people.

---

[3] This statement may appear somewhat inconsistent with the facts stated elsewhere, but in fact the friends there alluded to, as opposed to the union of Church and State, took no part in our subsequent proceedings. They were engaged in writing Tracts, or were absent from the University. They never cordially entered into the design of an Association, or of the Address and Declaration which emanated from it.

NOTE B.

GREAT MEETING OF THE CLERGY.

(*The Standard, Feb.* 6, 1834.)

"We refer with much pride to the following report of the proceedings of a meeting at Lambeth Palace of the Clergy delegated to represent the dioceses of England and Wales. The report reached our office at too late an hour to permit us to offer upon it the remarks which we feel its importance demands, and we therefore leave it for the present to the attention of our readers, who will, we are sure, exultingly agree with an observation made in the course of the day, that it is 'a triumphant meeting for the Church.'

"This morning having been appointed by his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury to receive the Address of the Clergy of England and Wales, at twelve o'clock the following Clergy, who had previously assembled at the house of Mr. Rivington, in Waterloo Place, proceeded to Lambeth Palace:—

Ven. James Croft, Archdeacon of Canterbury.
Dean of Lincoln, Dr. Gordon.
Dean of Carlisle, Dr. Hodgson.
Dean of Chichester, George Chandler, LL.D.
Archdeacon of London, Joseph Holden Pott, M.A.
Archdeacon of Middlesex, George Owen, Cambridge, M.A.
Archdeacon of Stowe, H. V. Bayley.
Archdeacon of Bedford, Dr. Bonney.
Archdeacon of Sarum, Liscombe Clarke, M.A.
Archdeacon of Brecon, Richard Davies.
Archdeacon of Taunton, Anthony Hamilton, M.A.
Archdeacon of Rochester, Walker King, M.A.
Archdeacon of St. Alban's, John James Watson, D.D.
Rev. Ashurst Turner Gilbert, D.D., Principal of Brazennose, Oxford.
Rev. Godfrey Faussett, D.D., Margaret Professor of Divinity, Oxford.
Rev. John Keble, Professor of Poetry, Oxford.
Rev. Christopher Wordsworth, D.D., Master of Trinity College, Cambridge.
Rev. John Bankes Hollingworth, D.D., Norrisian Professor of Divinity, Cambridge.

Rev. Ralph Tatham, B.D., Public Orator, Cambridge.
Rev. I. W. Baugh, M.A., Chancellor of Bristol, Proctor for Worcester.
Rev. W. F. Baylay, M.A., Proctor for Canterbury.
Hon. and Rev. Evelyn Boscawen, M.A., Proctor for the Chapter of Canterbury.
Rev. H. Fardell, M.A., Prebendary of Ely, Proctor for Ely.
Rev. John Hume Spry, D.D., Proctor for London.

"They were received in the library by his Grace the Archbishop, who was attended by his Chaplains.

"When the Venerable James Croft, Archdeacon of Canterbury, addressed the Archbishop in the following words:—

"'As Premier Archdeacon of England, I have the high honour of being deputed by my reverend brethren to approach your Grace on the present important occasion, with the Address of the Clergy of England and Wales; nor will I, in my own person, venture to say more than that I feel entitled thus to designate an address, which, notwithstanding some few slight and immaterial variations, is in all instances substantially the same, and has received the signatures of 6530 ministers of our Apostolical Church.'

"The Archdeacon then proceeded to read the

ADDRESS.

"'We, the undersigned Clergy of England and Wales, are desirous of approaching your Grace with the expression of our veneration for the sacred office, to which by Divine Providence you have been called, of our respect and affection for your personal character and virtues, and of our gratitude for the firmness and discretion which you have evinced in a season of peculiar difficulty and danger.

"'At a time, when events are daily passing before us which mark the growth of latitudinarian sentiments, and the ignorance which prevails concerning the spiritual claims of the Church, we are especially anxious to lay before your Grace the assurance of our devoted adherence to the Apostolical doctrine and polity of the Church over which you preside, and of which we are ministers; and our deep-rooted attachment to that venerable Liturgy, in which she has embodied, in the language of ancient piety, the Orthodox and Primitive Faith.

"'And while we most earnestly deprecate that restless desire of

change which would rashly innovate in spiritual matters, we are not less solicitous to declare our firm conviction, that should anything, from the lapse of years or altered circumstances, require renewal or correction, your Grace, and our other spiritual rulers, may rely upon the cheerful co-operation and dutiful support of the Clergy in carrying into effect any measures that may tend to revive the discipline of ancient times, to strengthen the connexion between the Bishops, Clergy and people, and to promote the purity, the efficiency, and the unity of the Church.'

"To which his Grace the Archbishop returned the following answer:—

"'Mr. Archdeacon, and my Venerable and Reverend Brethren,—I receive with peculiar pleasure this expression of your kindness towards me, and your approbation of my humble endeavours to do my duty; but I feel still greater satisfaction when I consider the object which you have principally in view, and the good effects which may be anticipated from this public declaration of your sentiments. If it has been ever surmised that the Clergy are wanting in attachment to the doctrine and polity of our United Church; that they have ceased to venerate the Liturgy, are distrustful of their spiritual governors, and desirous of change: this manifestation of your opinions and feelings will correct the mistake, and dissipate the hopes which may have been built on it. If, again, they are charged with partiality for defects and corruptions, and determined aversion to improvement, from bigotry or baser motives, such imputations are shown to be groundless by this address.

"'I regard it as a direct contradiction of misrepresentation and falsehoods of different kinds, which have been widely circulated; as an avowal of your unshaken adherence to our National Church, its faith and its formularies; and as a testimony of your veneration for the episcopal office, and of your cordial respect for your Bishops. By thus coming forward, you make known to the public the real dispositions of the Clergy; you place their love of order and of ancient principles beyond the reach of suspicion: you discourage rash innovation, without shutting the door against any improvements, which may be deemed sufficiently important to outweigh the evils incidental to change.

"'To myself and the other Prelates, although we have never had reason to doubt of the affection of our brethren, this voluntary assurance of your co-operation will yield effective support, and im-

part additional confidence. The gratifying proofs which you on this day have afforded us, of your approval in respect to the past, and of your reliance on our continued fulfilment of our sacred duties, are equally calculated to allay our anxieties, and to animate our exertions. For myself, I confess that, while I am deeply impressed with a sense of our danger, and conscious of my own infirmity, I look to the future without dismay, in the hope, that, through the blessing of Almighty God, and the aid of His Holy Spirit, the Church may not only be preserved from the perils which now threaten its existence, but be securely and permanently established, with an increase of usefulness and honour.'

"The Archbishop then received and returned the compliments of each of the Clergy present, when they withdrew.

"We understand that the addresses from some dioceses and archdeaconries have not yet been received, but the aggregate number of signatures will probably exceed eight thousand."

NOTE C.

Some difficulties which interposed to prevent the adoption of the Address are alluded to in the following letters:—

FROM A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT.

London, Dec. 16, 1833.

According to the suggestion and request of you and our other friends, Sir —— and I proceeded to Cambridge, and entered into full confidence and anxious deliberation with ——. The result was, the Address, of which I inclose a copy, which this morning we have submitted to Mr. ——, trusting that we should receive his valuable aid in putting it into circulation. To our great regret as well as surprise, Mr. —— (though I do not think he went so far as to say he would not sign it *if* issued) disapproves of it, and declines to take any share in the responsibility of promulgating it, on the grounds, 1st, That the temporal establishment of the Church is not made sufficiently prominent, and especially because a determination to support church-rates is not asserted specifically. 2nd,

That the aversion to change (unless by *Church* authority), in the spiritual concerns of the Church, is put forward too strongly, so as to be likely, in his opinion, to deter signatures. . . . . It becomes, therefore, now a matter for serious consideration, whether this Address should be put into circulation, and *how;* or whether we had better give it into other hands, and let it begin again *de novo.* . . . . Mr. —— seems afraid (as indeed did Archdeacon ——) of *any* Address being circulated avowedly by —— and me, who are known to be strong politicians, and in that caution we very much concur.

FROM A FRIEND.

London, Dec. 24, 1833.

. . . . . I have seen Sir ——. He is more than ever couvinced how important it is that the Clerical Address, which must be considered the greatest victory that has been achieved since the battle of Waterloo, should be presented in due form. Upon this point, therefore, you must, as one of the Oxford Committee, insist. . . .

Sir —— is now of opinion, that for some little time at least, nothing can be done for the Lay Address. He has not yet received answers from Lord Eldon, Lord Chandos, Sir R. Peel, or the Duke of Newcastle. From the Duke of Wellington, Mr. Goulbourn, and one or two others, he has received answers, not favourable to the doing anything at this present moment, which seems to be quite a critical one.

NOTE D.

I subjoin some extracts from letters received from various correspondents which will, in some degree, account for the limited measure of success which attended the Declaration of the Laity.

FROM ARCHDEACON ——,

W——, Jan. 27, 1834.

The Duke of Buckingham highly approves the Declaration, but says, "From what authority does it proceed?" Now surely you should print in the papers some account of the committee, chair-

men, secretaries, treasurers, &c. I am really at a loss what to say, not having one paper or scrap of information.

FROM ARCHDEACON ——.

——*E*——, *Jan.* 23, 1834.

You led me to suppose, about a fortnight since, that I should immediately receive a packet of the Declarations for the signatures of the Laity. I gave you the name of ——, as the person to whom the packet might be sent; but we have never received it, and are anxiously expecting it. I believe you wish to receive the names of peers, &c., who would subscribe, and therefore I beg to give you *Lord Rolle*, who is desirous of adding his name.

I would beg to suggest to your Committee, that this Declaration should be immediately followed up by Petitions, in answer to the four several points now claimed by Dissenters, namely, the abolition of church-rates, burial, marriage, and registration.

FROM THE SAME.

——*E*——, *Jan.* 30, 1834.

I am exceedingly anxious that our friends in London should take some more direct and regular means of obtaining signatures to the Lay Declaration. At present some packets of the papers have been sent to one or two gentlemen in E——, and to a few in the country, but no instructions are given, no notice as to whom the papers are sent, and what is to be done with them. In consequence a *very few* signatures are made, and no one takes any active part, and with some the papers remain positively as lumber. This is a sad state of things, but it is literally the case; all is confusion; our best friends are disheartened and discouraged—they confide in others, and nothing is done; a good cause is lost from want of purpose and active direction; and there will not be one tenth, nay, not *one hundredth* of the signatures obtained, which might have been procured by good management. If it be not too late, I most earnestly solicit that a communication be made from the Central Committee to ——, who will put them in the way of engaging agents in every district, perhaps in every parish.

FROM A CLERGYMAN.

Sherington, Newport Pagnel, Feb. 11, 1834.

I this morning received a letter from a very influential friend of mine connected with the county, and a firm friend of the Church, in

which he says he has been "much reproached" for not sending up the Declaration of the Laity. Col. C—— has as yet had no communication of any sort respecting it; you I hope received a letter from me in which I recommended his name as the properest to further the object in this part of the county, and he is quite ready to do anything that may be desired.

Copy of a letter received by Mr. W. Joy, Oxford, from a Clergyman in the neighbourhood of Ashby-de-la-Zouch.

Jan. 22, 1834.

If you have any knowledge of, or any influence with, the members of the Central Committee in London, who sent out the Declaration of the laity of the Church of England, which you showed me when in Oxford, do counsel them to take more efficient measures for having it signed. If they really had the cause at heart, they would not have sent it about in the careless way they have. I expected on my arrival at my parish to have found a copy of the Declaration; but instead of this, I heard that a neighbouring clergyman, an acquaintance of one of the members, had *a sheet of foolscap paper* sent to him with the Declaration printed on one side, and the direction on the other "For Ashby and its Neighbourhood;" so that the Ashby declaration and that of all the adjoining parishes has already gone back with ninety-three signatures; when Ashby alone would have furnished five hundred. Not a single name from . . . .; and many other parishes have been attached, because there was no room on the paper. If the Declaration is to be of use, it must be sent to every parish in the kingdom, and if I knew any one of the gentlemen who compose the Committee, or where they could be addressed, I would write this my opinion to them. Pray do what you can to remedy this fatal supineness of the Committee.

NOTE E.

I annex extracts from letters received about this time from Laymen.

FROM A GENTLEMAN.

Monmouth, Dec. 10.

. . . . If you will send me some printed Addresses, I will get the

signatures of the clergymen in this town and neighbourhood, and also forward some for signature to other parts of the county, unless you think proper yourself to write to those gentlemen I have named.

And if you will send me the Lay Address, or a copy, I will get that signed by the mayor, bailiffs, town clerk, common council, and principal inhabitants of this town, and also send it to the other towns in the county for signature. And if I can render any further assistance in the good cause in which you are engaged, you may command my services.

FROM A GENTLEMAN.

—— *Park, Feb.* 26.

In reply to yours just received, I beg to state that I have taken no part in circulating any *Declaration* of the Laity in this neighbourhood, having, prior to the publication of such by the Suffolk Street Committee, circulated and obtained signatures to the enclosed *Address* from every parish in this division of the county. Mr. ——, of Uffington, by whom the Address was drawn up, undertook a similar duty in the Wantage and Farringdon districts . . . . [This letter enclosed an Address from "the magistrates and other laymen resident in the county of Berks" to the Archbishop of Canterbury, expressive of their attachment to the Church of England.]

FROM A GENTLEMAN.

Lichfield Close, 26th March, 1834.

I have the pleasure to send you Declarations from the Laity in Lichfield, Norton, and Courley, and Shenstone, in Staffordshire, and also one from Sir Robert Peel and several highly respectable gentlemen in this neighbourhood. Sir Robert has authorized me by letter to add his name, which letter I can forward if necessary.

NOTE F.

The following is a copy of His Majesty's most gracious speech to the Bishops on the anniversary of His Majesty's birthday, in May, 1834:—

My Lords,—You have a right to require of me to be resolute in defence of the Church. I have been, by the circumstances of my life, and by conviction, led to support toleration to the utmost extent of which it is justly capable; but toleration must not be suffered to go into licentiousness: it has its bounds, which it is my duty, and which I am resolved to maintain. I am from the deepest conviction attached to the pure Protestant faith, which this Church, of which I am the temporal Head, is the human means of diffusing and preserving in this land.

I cannot forget what was the course of events which placed my family on the throne which I fill; those events were consummated in a revolution which was rendered necessary, and was effected, not as has sometimes been most erroneously stated, merely for the sake of the temporal liberties of the people, but for the preservation of their religion. It was for the defence of the religion of the country, that was made the settlement of the crown which has placed me in the situation that I now fill: and that religion and the Church of England and Ireland it is my *fixed purpose, determination, and resolution, to maintain.*

The present bishops, I am quite satisfied (and I am rejoiced to hear from them, and from all, the same of the clergy in general under their government), have never been excelled at any period of the history of our Church, by any of their predecessors, in learning, piety, or zeal, in the discharge of their high duties. If there are any of the inferior arrangements in the discipline of the Church (which, however, I greatly doubt), that require amendment, I have no distrust of the readiness or ability of the prelates now before me to correct such things, and to *you* I trust they will be left to correct with your authority unimpaired and unshackled.

I trust it will not be supposed that I am speaking to you a speech which I have *got by heart.* No, I am declaring to you my real and genuine sentiments. I have almost completed my sixty-ninth year, and though blessed by God with a very rare measure of health, not having known what sickness is for some years, yet I do not blind myself to the plain and evident truth, that increase of years must tell largely upon me when sickness shall come. I cannot, therefore, expect that I shall be very long in this world. It is under this impression that I tell you, that while I know that the law of the land considers it impossible that I should do wrong, that while I know there is no earthly power which can call me to account, this only makes me the more deeply sensible of

the responsibility under which I stand to that Almighty Being, before whom we must all one day appear. When that day shall come, you will know whether I am sincere in the declaration which I now make, of *my firm attachment to the Church, and resolution to maintain it.*

I have spoken more strongly than usual, because of unhappy circumstances that have forced themselves upon the observation of all. The threats of those who are enemies of the Church make it the more necessary for those who feel their duty to that Church *to speak out.* The words which you hear from me are indeed spoken by my mouth, but they flow from my heart.

His Majesty was observed to be much affected in the course of this speech, which was delivered with great emphasis.

NOTE G.

The *British Magazine* for July and August, contains accounts of numerous meetings and addresses to the King in gratitude for his declaration. Amongst the places from which such addresses were sent, may be mentioned Wisbeach, Tiverton, Poole, Colchester, Bristol, Cheltenham, Tewkesbury, Cirencester, Canterbury, Manchester, Liverpool, Warrington, Leicester, Oxford, Coventry, Salisbury, Leeds, Doncaster, Brecon, &c. On the 9th and 25th August, the King held levees, when the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dukes of Wellington, Rutland, Beaufort, and Newcastle; Earls of Falmouth, Winchelsea, Amherst, Cawdor, Warwick; Bishop of Exeter, the Mayor of Liverpool, and many other gentlemen and noblemen presented several hundreds of addresses to His Majesty from all parts of the United Kingdom, and from all classes and orders of society, expressive of attachment to the Church, and heartfelt gratitude for the royal declaration. Petitions in favour of the Church were at the same time pouring in by hundreds into the two Houses of Parliament.

NOTE H.

I was desirous of recording in this place the names of those who co-operated in our exertions for the defence of the Church, in the latter part of 1833, and the beginning of 1834. It would have shown that the movements which I have described were not in any respect connected with religious party—that men of very different views and connexions were equally zealous in the common cause. But I do not feel justified in mentioning names without special permission. I have before me a list, comprising the names of twenty-six Archdeacons, five Deans, and a great number of other dignitaries and beneficed Clergymen, fourteen Peers, and many members of Parliament, mayors of cities and boroughs, and private gentlemen, who took part in the effort which was made in support of the Church.

NOTE J.

It was our sincere endeavour to unite all parties in defence of the Church. This we did not hesitate to avow on all proper occasions. Some of our friends were by no means satisfied of our discretion on this point. In illustration of this, I subjoin some extracts from the letters of a very influential and respected friend.

October, 24, 1833.

I thank you much for the copy of the "Suggestions," which I duly received, and think them drawn up with both ability and caution, and defining very accurately the object of the Association, and supporting the measure by reasons which must satisfy every reasonable mind. Your letter I confess staggers me, for I am no novice in the points at issue, between the two parties designated Orthodox and Evangelical, and my conviction is, that without compromising fundamentals, no union between them can be formed. Such a union I admit to be most important; I could almost say vitally so to us both, and I am quite prepared to forget all the past,

and to give to every individual of the latter class the right hand of fellowship with all the cordiality possible, if they will lay aside Wesley's conceits, and return to the genuine doctrines of the Reformation. . . . I do not say these things to throw cold water upon your measures, but merely to urge deliberation, and the obtaining a clear understanding of the views of those to whom you join yourselves.

FROM THE SAME.

November 4, 1833.

I have this day several letters from persons to whose judgments much deference is due, and who all approve generally of our design, to which they will lend their best assistance, if the measures are well-advised, and seem calculated to effect not a hollow assemblage of differently-minded persons, but a solid substantial union. They urge caution and deliberation, being convinced that if the good is not effected, serious evil will ensue, and all express themselves not very sanguine in their hopes that the circulation of Tracts in the present stage of our affairs will contribute much to rouse that Church feeling which has so lamentably fallen to decay.

The union of parties was, notwithstanding these objections, accomplished in various places to a considerable extent, and quite sufficiently to secure co-operation in the same measures. A clergyman writes thus :—

Norwich, Feb. 1, 1834.

I have heard of only five or six persons in this radical county who have positively refused to sign the Address ; and their opinions in general have very little weight in the Church. Whigs and Tories, Evangelicals and High Churchmen, who have on no occasion been induced to act together before, have readily united in the present measure.

NOTE K.

The views of this eminent man are stated in the following extract from one of his letters :—

Trin. Coll. April 19, 1832.

. . . Let me inquire of you particularly what you had in view in saying that the success of the Magazine would depend on its boldly

advocating the cause of the Church. I am very anxious to do whatever can be done, and my plan is this :—I have called on a person in whose ability I have reliance, for a series of papers on the advantages of an Establishment, Ordinances, and a Liturgy, Discipline, on Episcopacy, &c. These things seem to me much wanted. I mean to follow them up by strong papers on the necessity of observing Church discipline, as far as the Clergy are concerned. . . . Pray tell me what more is expected, for whatever can be done I will do cheerfully. But if you think that there is a general wish and expectation that the Magazine should become an arena for the cause of the High Church against the Low Church as to doctrine, then I would rather leave the thing to others. I am a thorough High Churchman myself, both as to doctrine and discipline, but I can see little good to be done just now as to *doctrine* by fresh controversy, and have a strong confidence that if the Church holds out, we should get nearer one another by the adoption of sound discipline than by any other way.

I need not add that my friend had mistaken the purport of my letter: his sentiments were entirely in accordance with my own.

NOTE L.

The following extracts, from letters received from the Clergy of various parts of England, will suffice to show the objections to which the Tracts gave rise, and the embarrassment which was felt.

FROM ARCHDEACON CAMBRIDGE.

College, Ely, Nov. 19, 1833.

I beg to offer you my best thanks for the copy of the Address to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, and to assure you that I shall do my utmost to call the attention of the Clergy to it, and to obtain as many signatures as possible. I had previously seen it in manuscript, and received a printed copy through the kindness of my friend, Mr. N——, and immediately went over to Cambridge to confer with the —— on the subject. On his table I found a

number of Tracts which were proposed to be extensively circulated. We neither of us knew then, nor do I now know, how the Committee from which they are to be circulated is to be formed; but we are both agreed in opinion, that some obvious objections offer themselves to such a measure, at a moment when every other man thinks he can discover defects in our Church polity, and is willing to show how to reform them; and that however carefully these Tracts may be worded. they will be sure to give rise to controversy, which it ill becomes those distinguished characters who unite for the sole purpose expressed in the Address, to enter into. . . .

FROM A CLERGYMAN.

Sherington, Dec. 7, 1833.

I regret that I was premature in saying that ——'s name might be added to the intended Association: he is a warm friend to the Establishment, an able man, and an excellent Christian, . . . but he and many others do not approve of certain publications said to have their origin with some of the principal promoters of the forthcoming Lay Address. He would wish it to contain general declarations of attachment to the Liturgy, the Doctrines, and the Establishment of the Church of England, without going into any such questions as those relating to episcopacy, apostolicity, and so forth. The expressions "conveying the sacrifice to the people," of being "intrusted with the keys of heaven and hell," and being "intrusted with the awful and mysterious gift of making the bread and wine Christ's body and blood"—I lament to see used in the publications I allude to, and I feel sure that they will not tend to strengthen the Church in these days: we must take care how we aid the cause of Popery.

FROM THE SAME.

Dec. 13, 1833.

I was much gratified by the receipt of your letter to-day. I read *part* of it to ——, and I have little doubt of his signing the intended Address or Declaration. I ventured to copy, for ——, the following words of yours:—"These tracts, however, never had the sanction of any association: they were not written by leading members of the Association, and, on the contrary, they were written by persons who always opposed most strongly the idea of any association, and who are still opposed to it." . . . I think it probable that —— will be the means of checking the unfair line of conduct adopted by the *Record*.

FROM A CLERGYMAN.

——, *Newark, Dec.* 23, 1833.

I heard the other day (what I hope is true), that those of our Clergy who have set on foot this Address, have disclaimed that it has any connexion with certain publications that have issued from Oxford lately, and which have justly excited so much animadversion. I am sure that we should have lost many signatures in this county, if it had been understood that those who signed this Address would have thereby identified themselves with a Society which has sent forth publications which are far more likely to be prejudicial than beneficial to the Church at this juncture, and some of which contain statements that can by no means, I think, admit of proof from Scripture.

FROM A CLERGYMAN.

Cheltenham, Jan. 9, 1834.

We had a preparatory meeting here yesterday, for the purpose of stirring up the laity. It was only called to deliberate, and therefore nothing was done except to adopt the first resolution [alluding to resolutions in favour of the Church, inclosed]. . . . I do hope that the example of this diocese will be followed generally. The Clergy, I believe, are unanimous in the measure.

When I was in London I undertook, on the authority of your letter, to state that the Tracts had been *bonâ fide* giveu up. I have since seen what I suppose were they, advertised in the *Record*. I do sincerely wish that this was not so. They have been the cause of more injury to the *united* operations of the Church than can well be calculated.

FROM A CLERGYMAN.

——, *Derby, Jan.* 17, 1834.

Many (Clergy) have refused their signatures on account of a supposed connexion between the Address and the Oxford Tracts. . . I ought to mention, that last night I accidentally fell in with a Clergyman, a stranger to me, who resides at some distance from Derby, and who had refused his signature to the Address on account of the Oxford Tracts, or rather, perhaps, some remarks upou them in the *Record*. Your letter enabled me to remove his scruples, and he gave me his signature. I gave him a number of the copies of the Address, which he would, on his return home to-day,

give to several Clergymen of his acquaintance, who had refused for the same reason, and who, he thought, would now send their signatures. I hope they will arrive in time. . . . . I think it a sacred duty to do what lies in my power in behalf of our Holy Mother, both in the present struggle, and in that more important one which will, to all appearance, follow.

NOTE M.

The writer feels extremely reluctant to express any difference of opinion from the respected author of Tract 90. It will be sufficient for him to say, that he is of opinion that the Bishop of Exeter, in his Charge, has afforded a safer exposition of certain Articles, and of the general principles of interpretation. With reference to the principle of interpreting the Articles "in the most Catholic sense they will admit," the writer has spoken in a work recently published, in the following terms :—

The sense of the Church of England, therefore, is the sense in which the Articles are to be understood, and the Church has always understood them as she did in the sixteenth century; because she has never, by any act whatsoever since that time, expressed any *change of interpretation.* In still continuing, without remark, the same law which she enacted in the sixteenth century, she has afforded a pledge of her retaining the same sense she then had. How then is this sense of the Church to be ascertained?

I reply, first, that the Articles being designed to produce unity of opinion, the meaning of a *large part* of them is doubtless *plain and clear*, as every one admits it to be. This will, in itself, furnish the first rule for the interpretation of the remainder, viz., *that it shall not be contradictory to what is elsewhere clearly stated in the Articles themselves.*

Secondly, *the formularies of public worship*, comprising creeds, solemn addresses to God, and instructions of the faithful, which have been also approved, and always used by these Catholic Churches, furnish a sufficient testimony of the doctrine taught by them in the Articles; for they could never have intended that their Articles should be interpreted *in a sense contrary to the doc-*

trine clearly and uniformly taught in their other approved formularies. This then furnishes a second rule for interpreting the Articles.

Thirdly, since it is a declaration of the Church of England, that "a *just and favourable construction* ought to be allowed to all writings, especially such as are set forth by authority," it is apparently her desire that where any fair and reasonable doubt of her real sense shall remain, after the above rules have been applied unsuccessfully, that sense may be always understood to be *the best;* i.e. *the sense most conformable to Scripture and to Catholic tradition,* which she acknowledges as her guides. The very Convocation of 1571, which originally enjoined subscription to the Articles, declared at the same time the principle of the Church of England, that nothing ought to be taught as an article of faith except what was supported by the authority of Scripture and Catholic tradition.

It must here, however, be most particularly observed, that the rule of interpreting the Articles in the *most Catholic* sense, is one which must not be vaguely and indiscriminately applied to all the Articles, as if we were at liberty to affix to them whatever meaning seems to us most consistent with Scripture or with tradition. The principle thus applied would lead to most dangerous tampering with the authorized formularies of the Church; would open the way for evasions of their most evident meaning, and thus render them wholly useless as tests of belief or persuasion. But if the principle of interpreting the Articles in the most Catholic sense be restricted to *those particular cases where a legitimate doubt* of the meaning of any article exists, and when it cannot be solved *either by the language of other parts of the articles, or of the other formularies of the Church,* it is wholly devoid of any latitudinarian tendency, and only tends to the benefit of the Church and of Christian truth.—*Treatise on the Church of Christ,* vol. ii. pp. 213, 214, ed. 1842.

ADDITIONAL NOTE.

The expression of attachment to the formularies of the Church of England, which was conveyed in the Address to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the evident danger in which those formularies were placed by the continual demands of innovators, drew from the sister Churches of Scotland and Ireland Declarations designed to encourage the English Church

under the difficulties which surrounded her. These important Declarations were as follow :—

DECLARATION OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

We, the undersigned Bishops, Presbyters, and Laity of the Episcopal Communion in Scotland, deem it expedient, under existing circumstances, to declare—

1. That the Protestant Episcopal Church in Scotland is a branch of the Catholic Apostolic Church of Christ, and has, by the blessing of Almighty God, maintained, through all the vicissitudes of our history, the scriptural and primitive system of prelacy for the ordering of her pastors and the government of her community.

2. That this Church did voluntarily adopt the Book of Common Prayer, as it has hitherto been prescribed by the united Church of England and Ireland, being persuaded that it contains a form of worship agreeable to the word of God, conformable to the practice of antiquity, and eminently fitted to cherish sound opinions and spiritual affections in the minds of those who use it; and that while on the one hand we admit the Liturgy to be imperfect, as all human compositions must be, and on the other hand consider the great body of popular objections to it to have no foundation in truth, and often by their discordant and contradictory nature to refute or neutralize each other, we fear the majority of objectors wear too decidedly the graver aspect of heresy or schism to be as yet conciliated by any alterations which we might deem expedient, judicious, or safe.

3. That while we thankfully recognize our entire freedom as a Church to choose our mode of worship, we sincerely rejoice that hitherto no impediment has arisen to our accordance in this respect with the sister Church in England, and cordially sympathize with her in the dread of any hasty or undue interference with her Liturgy; and we trust that as the Book of Common Prayer was originally ratified and confirmed in England by an Act of Convocation, and as an ecclesiastical synod is the only source from which such alterations should proceed, the constitution and integrity of that Church will yet be respected as it ought to be, and no attempt be made to effect a change in her formularies by an extraneous and incompetent authority.

From a copy sent to the Hon. and Rev. A. P. Perceval, by the Bishop of Ross and Argyle, 10th March, 1834.

DECLARATION OF THE CHURCH OF IRELAND.

The Archbishop of Armagh presented to his Majesty, at the levee held upon his birthday, the Address, of which the following is a copy. The Address we are informed was signed by seventeen out of the twenty Irish prelates, and by the clergy, with few exceptions, of those dioceses in which it was circulated: 1441 names are affixed to it. The Archbishop of Dublin and the Bishop of Kildare, it is understood, objected to the Address. The Bishop of Meath approved of it, but did not sign it.

TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

We, the undersigned Archbishops, Bishops, and Clergy of the Irish branch of the united Church of England and Ireland, dutifully crave permission to approach your Majesty with a declaration of our deliberate, unshaken, and cordial attachment to the polity, the doctrine, and worship of the Church, as by law established.

Admitted, as we have been, to the ministry of that Church, on the faith of our avowed adherence to its principles and institutions, such a declaration on our part might be deemed superfluous in ordinary seasons.

But the times in which our lot is cast are not of an ordinary character. We trust, therefore, that it will not be deemed unbecoming in us, if, actuated solely by a sense of duty, we openly make profession of our sentiments, hoping that we may thereby contribute, under the Divine blessing, to check the prevailing fondness for innovation, to give mutual encouragement and support to each other, and to remove that disquietude and distrust, which have been produced by the apprehension of ill-advised changes, in the minds of those who are committed to our spiritual care.

We conscientiously believe that the polity of our Church is modelled, as closely as diversity of circumstances will permit, on the ecclesiastical institutions founded by our Lord's Apostles, and transmitted to us by their successors; that the system of our doctrine embodies the faith once declared unto the saints; and that our Liturgy is framed after the pattern of the best remains of primitive Christianity, conveying at all times the fundamental truths of the Holy Scripture, and not seldom in its express words.

In a Church thus pure in doctrine and apostolical in formation, whose religious services are endeared by long usage to the doctrinal

feelings of its members, and whose polity harmonizes with the institutions of the State, to which it has ever proved itself a faithful and judicious ally, we deprecate the introduction of undefined changes and experiments; and we humbly trust that no alteration will be made in the discipline and services of our Church, but by the sanction and recommendation of its spiritual guardians.

Should, however, abuses be found to exist in our ecclesiastical establishment, we profess our readiness to co-operate for their removal.

But we humbly submit to your Majesty, in the language of the preface to our "Book of Common Prayer," that "experience showeth that where a change hath been made of things advisedly established, no evident necessity so requiring, sundry inconveniences have thereupon ensued, and those more and greater than the evils that were intended to be remedied by such change."

That accordingly it is wiser to submit to small and questionable inconvenience, than by impatiently attempting its removal to expose ourselves to the risk of great and undoubted evil.

That if it be "reasonable," as in the language of the same preface we admit it to be, "that upon weighty and important considerations, according to the various exigency of times and occasions, such changes and alterations should be made in our forms of divine worship, and the rites and ceremonies appointed to be used therein, as to those that are in place or authority should from time to time seem either necessary or expedient;" it is no less reasonable that such alterations as are at any time made, should be shown to be either "necessary or expedient;" and that we do not apprehend this to have been done in respect of the changes which various persons, widely differing among themselves, are understood to have in contemplation.

That a general agreement as to the things requiring correction, the nature and extent of such correction, and the mode of applying it, may be reasonably demanded from the persons desirous of change, as an indispensable preliminary to the concurrence of others with their views.

That an opening once made for innovation gives occasion to alterations not limited to the particulars which were supposed to stand in need of redress, but indefinitely extended to others, which were previously esteemed to be free from all objection.

And that thus incalculable danger, arising from comparatively small beginnings, may accrue to our apostolical form of polity, and to the purity of the Christian doctrine incorporated in our public services.—*British Magazine, July*, 1834

SUPPLEMENT TO THE NARRATIVE.

CHAPTER I.

DIVISION OF TRACTARIANISM, AND FALL OF THE ROMANIZING PARTY.

THE publication of the "Narrative," fortified as it was by the approbation of a great number of leading Churchmen, and directed immediately against the Romanizing party in the Church of England, excited general attention. It was printed and kept in type with a view to meet an uncertain demand, and its sale extended to several thousands, while information came that in America 100,000 had been printed and sold. This publication was a serious attack upon the Romanizers, and it was the more so, because they were unable to excite passion against a work which was studiously divested of every offensive element.

We anxiously awaited the next step of the Romanizers, and before long we learned that Ward, who was the most prominent of the party, a chief writer in the *British Critic*, and a man of singular fluency, ability, and self-confidence, was preparing a work upon the subject. It appeared in a few weeks, having been written with the utmost celerity. It was a bulky volume, closely printed, and was entitled the "Ideal of the Christian Church," avowedly in reply to my "Narrative."

The "Ideal" was, as might be expected, a very able,

plain-spoken, and courageous publication. I own that I felt some nervousness upon its appearance, apprehending that a man of Ward's ability and acuteness would be able to find some weak points in the "Narrative," on which he might found a charge of misrepresentation, or contrive to find matter of offence, and thus turn off the question to collateral topics, besides accusing me of unfairness. I thought that he might perhaps dispute my facts, and the reasonings grounded on them, which might involve me in a tedious controversy; but I was immediately relieved from any such apprehensions on the perusal of Mr. Ward's "Ideal." It candidly admitted the force of my indictment. It boldly justified the Roman party for advocating Roman Catholic principles and practices in the Church of England, and claimed for the members of that Church the right to hold and teach the whole circle of Roman Catholic doctrine as members of the English Church—that is, to profess one set of doctrines, and to teach another, which denounced the first as heretical. This paradox was defended with the utmost boldness and sophistry; and consequently the "Narrative" here reprinted was justified and confirmed in every point by Ward's "Ideal." I had nothing more to do. The charges I had made were completely established by the confession of the culprit.

Events however not anticipated took place. The Church in all its schools (except the Romanizing and the Rationalizing) promptly took up the question, and called for the punishment of Ward, who had thus insulted the Church of England. The University of Oxford, indignant at such an outrage, assembled and passed a vote depriving Ward of his degrees. The measure had been vehemently opposed by the Romanizing party, who called in the aid of the Rationalists; but the decree was carried, and Ward was expelled from the University. A

short time elapsed, when we heard of his open secession to Rome, of which he had so long been the secret advocate; and Oakeley followed the same course; and every day the Romanizing party appeared more distinctly under their true colours; and a crisis was evidently approaching which would be determined by Newman's conduct. During all these movements—the Romanizing publications of the *British Critic*, and the incident of Ward's degradation—Newman remained silent and in seclusion. It appears from his "Apologia" that his mind was deeply unsettled during this interval. He was weighing the claims of the Churches, and could not come to any decision. He must have been reluctant to quit the cause of the Church of his baptism, and which he had so long endeavoured to strengthen and to purify, and in which his whole life had been spent. It appears, indeed, that he was always unable to determine intellectually where the truth lay, and that he yielded at last to an imaginary and enthusiastic impulse, which he supposed to be celestial. But at this time no one knew what his real sentiments were, or what he was meditating. His position however was such, that no one ventured to intrude on his privacy, and all looked with great anxiety to the result. From his different principles, it was difficult to say whether the event might be Romanism, or a return to the Church, or the adoption of Rationalism and Infidelity. He had always rejected the external evidences of Christianity, and admitted none except those which are subjective. No one could tell what the result would be.

It was evident, however, that Newman had received a deep mental shock: his faith was utterly shaken; and I could not but remember the spirit he had shown when remonstrated with on the Romanizing excesses of the *British Critic*. Newman was deeply hurt and offended

at the condemnation of his work by the authorities, feeling that his efforts in behalf of the Church had been ungratefully received, that his objects had been frustrated, that the union of Churches was further off than ever, that Protestantism had gained the ascendency in the Church of England over his views of Catholicism. His work was interrupted, and he could not endure it. Had he been patient, and could he have submitted to censures—could he have entertained the notion that the fault of this collapse lay in some degree at his own door, his immovable obstinacy, and his rashness—could he have entertained the notion that he was not infallible, that his system was not wholly faultless, and that he might have some mistakes to acknowledge,—he might have endured, as Pusey did, the censure of his works, submitted to the storm, and in time resumed all his influence. But the difference was this. Pusey honestly and sincerely believed the Church of England to be a part of the Church of Christ. He faithfully adhered to this principle, which lay at the root of the whole movement, and of its Tractarian development. He did not consider the movement as directed to an inquiry into the merits and claims of Churches. That point had been settled before men entered into combination to maintain and support the Church of England. It was no more open.

But Newman's views were inconsistent with this. From the beginning he had allowed speculation without bounds, and at length this bore fruit. He (apparently) and his leading followers became doubtful of the Catholicity of the English Church so early as 1839, through the perusal of Dr. Wiseman's sophistical articles in the *Dublin Review,* and from the effect of this reopening the question between the Churches, which involved the very basis of Church principles—the truth of the Church of England, sprang doubts which really severed those

who entertained them from the Tractarian and Church movement. They were thenceforth weak and decaying branches. It does not seem that this party ever afterwards recovered a firm faith in the Church of England. They did not know what Church to submit to. They finally settled in the Church of Rome, deceived by the arrogance of its pretensions and the boldness of its assertions.

When Newman felt the universal disapprobation which Tract 90 experienced, he had not sufficient confidence in the force of truth to yield to the temporary pressure, and to wait for results. His spirit was wounded: his feeling as it seemed to me was, "As they have thought proper to condemn me, I will not interfere: let them take the consequences." That was not, in my opinion, the spirit which should have been cultivated: it was essentially hostile: it was wanting in Christian Charity and humility, and it naturally prepared the way for a lapse into the meshes of Rome.

If this great man had been then really faithful to the Church of England, his own condemnation (however unjust in his own opinion) should not have prevented him from interfering to check the excesses of younger writers, which were doing such harm to the Church, and to the cause of Christian union. But he was detached from the Church. He was like the shepherd "that seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep, and fleeth," whose "own the sheep are not."

The result of Newman's long silence began gradually to appear. His work on "Development" had prepared the way, though ambiguously, for the reception of all the later superstitions of Rome, even in their last forms. Then appeared a document from him, in which he retracted all the statements in his previous writings contrary to the Church of Rome, or differing from it. And having

made this retractation, he finally, in 1845, was received into the Church of Rome, and was baptized anew, and in due time, after study under the Jesuits at Rome, was ordained in the Church of Rome, and forthwith preached against the Church of England, which he had for so many years advocated, as avowedly and reputedly its most attached and faithful member.

Newman's personal influence, as has been said, was prodigious. No man wielded a more extensive influence over the opinions and actions of others, or was more enthusiastically followed. A large section of the Church followed his lead implicitly. Men of abilities and learning adopted his opinions almost blindly. His numerous volumes of parochial sermons are models of excellence. He had written against Rome; he had often and earnestly repudiated all connexion with Rome. And yet here was this leader of the Church—this man in all respects so remarkable—apparently convinced at last by the force of Rome's argument, and unwillingly becoming a convert to it.

Well might all Churchmen tremble, under the apprehension that the Church would be shaken to the centre by such a phenomenon—that the clergy would be divided, the laity led astray—that Rome would at once gain ascendency—that the cause of Church principles would perish when so awful an example of its practical working and results had been given. Churchmen were in despair. I myself thought that the last hour of Church principles, if not of the Church of England, had come. I knew not what to hope, and dared not look forward into the future. It was as if a moral earthquake had just occurred.

With Newman, or soon after, fell a few well-known clergy. Robert Wilberforce, Manning, and half a dozen other known names, and a handful of the aristocracy. About fifty clergy apostatized with them. The newspapers daily trumpeted forth their names. We could not tell

how far the plague had spread. They might be the advanced guard of numberless secessions—perhaps of the mass of the nation, for all we could tell.

As the smoke cleared away, we could gradually see the extent of the disaster. Newman had fallen, with two or three men his immediate partisans, and some forty or fifty clergy—men of bigoted opinions, whose names were not known as men of any eminence. I was curious to know on what motives these new converts joined the Church of Rome. I found on inquiry from those who conversed with them, that the usual motive with them for joining the Church of Rome was not any argument or mental conviction that the Church of Rome was the true Church, or any examination of the controversy, but simply an internal impulse or inclination to join that Church, which was ascribed to the movement of the Holy Ghost. Of course this at once deprived these secessions of all argumentative weight.

They appeared at once in their true character of enthusiastic and irrational movements of self-will, and only weakened the cause of Rome intellectually, as demonstrating the absence of intellectual proof, and dependence upon the merest and wildest assumption, such as any system however monstrous might be able to produce equally well.

It was, however, impossible to say where such a doctrine as this, which was avowed even by Newman himself, who advocated this notion of an internal impulse or inward sense (a characteristic of enthusiasm and philosophy), might extend. Happily, however, the sober sense, the intellectual vigour, and the sound principles of the English clergy and people were able to withstand the shock. As time passed on it was seen that the number of new followers of Newman in his secession gradually diminished. It was soon exhausted. When the number came to be reckoned up, and compared with the multitudes

who showed no sign of wavering in their Christian course, it shrank into small dimensions. Perhaps fifty clergy out of twenty thousand fell. The Church was disturbed by these secessions. It was amazed, indignant, alarmed lest others should follow the example. But in faith and communion it remained perfectly settled and undisturbed. The Romanizing party had formed but a minute fragment —a diseased and painful sore; but it had departed and gone; and the Church, far from feeling the pain of excision, was relieved. The Church stood fast in her principles; and though there were still some weak members who were in some danger, they did not proceed to the length of seceding, and they speedily obtained in Pusey a leader and guide.

Immediately upon Newman's secession, and the collapse of the Romanizing party, Pusey threw himself into the breach and published letters announcing himself as the leader of the Tractarian movement, and mentioning Newman without any censure, as merely taking service in another part of the Lord's vineyard. Pusey would never permit a word of censure against Newman; he adopted his views except those directly opposed to the Church; but he had sufficient confidence in the Church of England as a branch of the Universal Church not to sanction any secession from it. His principle, however, was as far as possible to conciliate the semi-Romanizing party, by adoption of its tenets and practices, and by the introduction of tenets and practices from Rome calculated to meet their tastes. With the same view he prompted and encouraged translations from Roman Catholic works of a devout character altered to harmonize with the Church of England; but it is very difficult to divest Roman Catholic books of principles which are inconsistent with our own.

I must confess that Pusey's proceedings as the self-constituted leader of the Tractarian party often caused to

me very great uneasiness. I shared in the opinions of Bishop Wilberforce and Dr. Hook on this point. I should have gladly seen Pusey attempt to reform mistakes introduced by Newman, and endeavouring to correct, instead of seeming to go along with the ultra-Tractarian mistakes. I was also distressed by his assumption of a leadership of an organized party; but in the end I became satisfied that the position he occupied was for the good of the Church. He advocated and allowed of nothing that was actually wrong, nothing which was not open to considerations of expediency. He had to control a very uncertain party, open to Newman's influence for some time—a party which was unsettled in principle and might easily be driven into secession. I believe that under Divine Providence his work was overruled to the great purpose of gradually steadying in the faith, and making available for the service of the Church, abilities and energies which if harshly and rudely treated, and cut off from sympathy (as many sincere Christians desired) would have proved a source of weakness to religion, instead of a source of strength, and under these impressions I cannot but regard in Pusey a great benefactor of the Church of England.

I should myself have often been in favour of a sterner and more direct policy towards all who shared in semi-Romanizing and Ritualistic opinions, and whom Pusey conciliated; but my own opinions were proved to be faulty by the result; for by mild methods the Church has been saved from further disruption, and retains all the energies which a different mode of proceeding might have lost. And I also see that in proportion as time has proceeded, extreme and indefensible opinions have been gradually eliminated; that the Church has reaped the benefit of all which have been left; and that the truth has been gradually finding its level and assuming the ascendency,—in a word that the

true principles of the Church of England have been more carefully studied, and more generally adopted; so that, in the long-run, the hope which I originally entertained that truth would eventually find its level in England has been happily verified to a great degree.

Pusey regulated the affairs of the remains of the Tract party, which were very powerful and numerous, from 1845 to 1882, a period of nearly forty years, with great skill; and outlived all censures, dying amidst universal national tributes of respect and affection, even on the part of those who did not wholly agree with his views. He witnessed the gradual rise of the Church herself into the place of activity and influence which he himself and all true Churchmen had long desired, and which has rendered the action of voluntary unions and organizations less desirable; nay, in some cases prejudicial; and it may be fervently hoped that the day for organization under individuals may have finally passed away, and that the Church's synods and modes of action may henceforth take the place of private and individual action, which for a long time was the only safeguard of the Church.

Though slightly out of its place, I have here to advert to the close of the *British Critic*, which had long been a dangerous instrument in behalf of the Church of Rome. In the "Narrative" the extreme evil arising from the continuance of that periodical had been insisted upon, and the impossibility of its continuance as a Church organ. In conference with friends at Oxford, it was agreed to make an effort to establish another Church organ to counteract the *British Critic*. Upon waiting on Mr. F. Rivington, the esteemed publisher of the latter, and proposing what had been agreed on, Mr. Rivington most liberally expressed his willingness to suspend the publication of a periodical which had given such general offence, and to publish a new quarterly, of which I was to be the

editor. I was reluctant to undertake the task, but it was pressed upon me by friends. The new publication, in the then divided state of the Church, was not of a sufficiently party character to obtain extensive support, and shortly came to an end; but the Church was delivered from the quarterly attacks of the *British Critic*, which had become virtually a Roman Catholic organ under Church of England colours. The relief of the Church at the termination of this unceasing sore was indescribable.

So much for the decline and fall of the Romanizing system in the Church of England, by which the Author of evil sought to destroy the Church by divisions, and to introduce all the evils of the Roman system into her pure and reformed faith; to subvert religion, and to render the combination of Churchmen in support of their common faith an instrument for bringing it to naught.

We see on the other hand the protection afforded to His own cause in time of need by God—the steadfastness of faith given to some; the rash audacity sent to the agents of evil; the strengthening of the great body of believers; the instruments raised up for the settling and confirming of weaker brethren; the destruction of individual influences once deemed boundless, so that in the trial their power proved but insignificant—the small effect that they produced, after the greatest apprehension had been entertained of their results. The Lord fought for us, and brought the Church safely through the severest trials, and frustrated the designs of the Adversary; and, after the Church had been thoroughly awakened by its dangers, directed all its energies into new channels, and endowed it with fresh strength, and has made it what it now is, God's great witness upon earth in the latter days.

CHAPTER II.

REVIVAL OF SYNODAL ACTION WITH LAY CO-OPERATION.

After the secession of Newman and his friends from the Church, Churchmen were for a time too much engaged with the event, and too much alarmed at what might be the consequence, to engage in any fresh discussions. Pusey at once stepped into Newman's place, and endeavoured to rally round him the entire Tractarian connexion, now deserted by its leader. For a time a species of lull in religious matters took place. At last, about 1849, four years after the secession of Newman and his friends, a fresh source of discord arose to inflame passions and create divisions in the Church, and alienate affections from her.

In 1849 commenced a strong struggle in England between the Evangelical principle and that of the rest of the Church. The able and excellent Bishop of Exeter (Philpotts) held it to be his duty to refuse the nomination of an Evangelical clergyman who denied the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. The question came eventually before a new legal tribunal, a Committee of Privy Council, established without notice or observation, a short time previously, for the trial of all ecclesiastical questions. This tribunal professed to be guided not by any views of Christian truth, or any spiritual or traditional authority such as had hitherto been the rule in Church tribunals,

but solely by the language of the Church formularies interpreted by law; so that the doctrine of the Church of England was henceforth to become a matter of judge-made law. This tribunal, which is open to political influences, pronounced its decision against the Bishop, being probably afraid of the threatened secession of Evangelicals if the decision proved unfavourable to them.

Great heart-burnings were the result, and some who were weak in the faith took the opportunity to secede to Rome; but the Church, though aggrieved by the existence of a tribunal so badly constituted, indulged in the hope that it would be improved so as to become tolerable; and by patience seems to be approaching the accomplishment of its object, the protection of the faith and doctrine of the Church against legal innovations.

The next twenty years unhappily witnessed the struggles of opposing views before this unfortunate tribunal, which decided in various directions, and alternately gave the advantage to different parties, according to the views or opinions which happened to prevail, and caused continual irritation in various directions, and dangers to the faith of the weaker brethren. It would be impossible here to describe the details of the numerous suits, relating to doctrine and discipline and rites, which have been the subjects of decision by lawyers since the day when Bishop Philpotts commenced the fray, and which must be regarded as an unfortunate one for the Church. Objecting, as I did, to the principle adopted by the tribunal of determining the question wholly by legal principles and interpretations, as if the Prayer Book was an Act of Parliament compiled by lawyers, and not a theological and Christian formulary, I took part against the decision, and joined in a meeting called to protest against it in 1850; but so great was the jealousy at that

time existing against the Romanizing tendencies, of which Pusey was apparently a patron, that when a proposal was made that an organization should be formed to oppose future judgments of the same nature, as it was understood that Pusey was to be at the head of the movement, it was felt necessary that the new organization should afford guarantees for its fidelity to the Church of England by repudiating Romanism. This proposal was warmly supported by Churchmen, among whom I may name Mr. W. H. Hoare, Dr. Biber, and Archdeacon Denison. It was opposed by Pusey and his party. In the meeting which took place in 1850 I was put forward to advocate the plan. It was opposed by Pusey and Keble (who was brought up from the country against it) and was rejected by a majority, upon which we, as previously agreed, seceded, and formed a separate organization, on anti-Roman principles. Its chief leaders were Mr. W. H. Hoare, one of the most eminent men and devoted Churchmen of his time, and Dr. Biber, who was originally German, but whose great ability and energetic zeal inspired full confidence, and entitled him to bear a part in Hoare's work.

Of the new union I was a member, and some leading men pressed on me the office of president, but I declined to accept the position, being in the first place weary of party movements, and secondly because I found an invincible repugnance to act with Evangelicals, even in maintenance of common objects.

Before long this Church Society merged in another and more important one, the Society for the Revival of Convocation, and this society, having secured the support of the bishops, especially Bishop Wilberforce, exerted itself with such vigour and perseverance in the cause it had taken in hand, that contrary to all expectation it actually obtained from the then ministry a consent to the

meeting of Convocation for the despatch of business, after it had been closed and lifeless for the preceding century and upwards. This step in advance gained by the Church constituted a make-weight against the irritation caused by the judgments of the Committee of Council. It was the greatest step yet made by the Church: its importance was not at once seen. It was gained by steady perseverance in Church principles without exaggeration or taint of Romanism. It was merely the concession of an unquestionable right; of rights which had from time immemorial been exercised; which were suspended by arbitrary power; the suspension of which the present Church had not merited; and which were exercised by the establishment in Scotland, and by every other religious body in the world. Common equity therefore demanded that they should no longer be withheld from the Church of England. I had seen this demand put forward as long as I remember anything, but it had been so uniformly ignored, that I believed it impossible that it ever would be attended to. Yet, in the providence of God, this impossibility had actually come to pass.

The reassembling of Convocation was the great step for which Churchmen had been labouring for generations. It was the restoration of the Church's suspended life to freedom. We had now to look forward, not to the sole action of individual leaders, which was almost certain to degenerate into party, the forerunner of schism; but to the life of the Church of England, acting as a Church, and therefore as a whole, which would comprise the various parties hitherto dividing and weakening the Church, and which her enemies delighted to see contending; and would lead them all to exert their common energies for the common good—for the sacred and unquestionable interests of the Church of England; acting on that great principle—"union is strength."

But the mere revival of Convocation was not enough. It needed to be supplemented by the use made of it by Churchmen—by the patience and forbearance with which differences of opinion were encountered—by the temperate arguments with which erroneous tenets were met. Often have I marvelled at the long-suffering patience of Convocation, while its time was worse than wasted by the enunciation of dangerous principles alien to the belief of those who heard them—patience amidst opposition to every good and orthodox proposal, amidst wild plans and peculiar ideas, and amidst language often irritating; and how bravely, on the whole, Convocation did its part, hampered as it was by Government privilege, and by members who had been brought up under a system of Government tutelage, of which they could not divest themselves, or recognize the altered position which was assumed when Government became the patron of all religions and Churches equally.

For many years the Convocation did its work, amidst the sneers and obloquy of the journalistic press, which prevented it as far as possible from action and endeavoured to excite jealousy of every movement; or pointed out its contradictions, and ridiculed it as impotent and enslaved by the temporal power. Nevertheless the excellent temper and the businesslike habits of this representative body at last won respect from all parties, and increased its influence. Its enemies were obliged to confess that its debates were conducted with sense, temperance, and dignity; and they were disappointed in their hope of seeing the Convocation such a scene of party discord that its suppression might be again called for. To the admirable temper, forbearance, and judgment of the Upper and the Lower House of Convocation, must be largely ascribed the great success of the Church of England which followed, together with the healing of

divisions, and the general extinction of party spirit and of the influence of party leaders and organizations which we have been spared to witness. The resistance to dangerous innovations, which used to be the self-imposed task of weak individuals, or their friends and supporters, is now entrusted to the care of Convocation, and of the congresses, conferences, and synods which have replaced the provincial synods of the Church, and which are open to the discussions of all the members of the Church, lay as well as clerical, and men of all parties—for it is the object of the Church to combine and not to divide, provided combination is made a reality. May that Christian principle ever prevail in the councils of the Church of England!

But the revival of Convocation was only the introduction to other movements of a similar character, supplementary to the great step which had been gained. After some years' experience it was perceived that the Convocation, though still the formal synod of the Church of England, dating from a deep antiquity, and notwithstanding the truly admirable and edifying manner in which it had been conducted, yet laboured under certain difficulties. It was unable to carry out its desires and resolutions without the co-operation of Government, which could not be depended upon. It was also not a proper representation of the clergy, the majority being composed of officials or dignitaries. And it did not include any representation of the laity whatever. I always thought that the Church synods should enlist the services of the attached and loyal laity—the communicants of the Church; and that the strength of Church organizations in the country would be indefinitely increased if the faithful laity could be joined with the clergy in co-operation. Objections in point of form were made to their introduction into Convocation. I do not profess to understand the legal view of the case; but it

was clear that many of the clergy most strongly objected to the introduction of laymen into Convocation, which they thought would destroy the legal character of that assembly.

These objections, then, presenting themselves, it was necessary that the Church should devise other methods for taking the laity into council, that is for showing that the clergy entertained no doubt or jealousy of the lay members of the Church, who were equally interested in the prosperity of that Church, and who were rendering such great and noble services when faithful to our cause. All this, and the desire for free discussion and comparison of opinions among Churchmen, led at length, in 1860, to the establishment of a general Congress of Churchmen, to assemble in some central position once in each year; and to include voluntary members, clergy and laity, from all parts of the Church of England. The first of these meetings was held under the presidency of an Archdeacon, at Cambridge, in 1860. Since then there have been twenty-two annual meetings held in all the principal towns of the kingdom, under the presidency of the bishop of the diocese, consisting of voluntary bodies of clergy and laity from all parts, to the number frequently of above 4000. In these congresses subjects previously arranged are treated in elaborate papers, frequently exhibiting much knowledge and thought, and are then freely discussed by appointed speakers, and the opinion of the meetings is frequently strongly expressed.

These meetings of Churchmen attract universal attention. They teach Churchmen to discuss the most important subjects with temper and good-will. They demonstrate unsuspected agreement upon many points. They diminish party feelings; and they afford to the laity their share in supporting what is right, and in recommending what is practicable, and likely to be acceptable. Altogether,

these congresses aid to form and to unite public opinion in the Church of England, and to prepare the way for the final and more formal action of Convocation; of the Episcopate; and of the Legislature, when its aid can be obtained. It is in fact part of that preliminary discussion which has always taken place in Christian councils, even from the first ages, prior to the enactment of canons and decrees of importance, and of which we see a model in the Council of Jerusalem in the Acts of the Apostles.

The laity of the Church of England were thus given their share in the discussions of the Church, and it was seen that those who join in Church movements are not the nominal members of the Church as determined by mere locality or rate-paying—men who are sometimes ignorant of the principles of their Church, and uninterested in her welfare; but the real members of the Church; who are as truly interested in her welfare as the clergy—men like the laity who in 1833-34 voluntarily joined in the Address to the Archbishop of Canterbury, declaring their loyalty to the Church of England.

No sooner had the working of these congresses been seen, and especially the action of the laity who joined in them, than the whole episcopate of England by degrees began to revive the synodal action of their dioceses. They did not restore the ancient diocesan synods which Bishop Philpotts of Exeter had shown to be lawful; probably because those synods consisted of clergy only, and the great object was to give to the laity also their share in the representation of the Church. Consequently they established, in lieu of synods, "Diocesan Conferences." This highly important organization was first established in the Diocese of Ely in 1864, and it has spread to all or nearly all the dioceses of the Church. The constitution of the conference, or virtual synod, in each diocese varies

according to its constitution, regulated by the bishop of the diocese. In most cases, however, the rule has been to introduce representative laymen in about the same numbers as the clergy. To take the case of Bath and Wells, 180 clergy represent the ruridecanal chapters of the clergy, 270 are lay delegates (communicants of the Church) from parishes, and certain leading officials of the diocese. The conference meets yearly in each archdeaconry, and triennially in the diocese. In Canterbury the synod is formed of a quarter of the clergy, with an equal number of lay delegates, and other officials. The numbers and rules of election vary in all the dioceses; but they essentially agree in organizing the whole clergy and laity of each diocese for conference and action upon Church questions, and entirely supersede the action of Church unions, which used formerly to be the only mode of expressing the sentiments of Churchmen and were apt to assume a party character.

In each Diocesan Conference subjects for discussion are introduced with the bishop's approval, generally bearing on practical subjects immediately affecting the interests of religion and the Church of England, and resolutions are moved, committees appointed, memorials to Government adopted, and dangerous innovations censured. To understand the extent of the organization of these diocesan bodies, it must be remembered that they represent about 20,000 clergy, and consist of about equal numbers of clergy and laymen.

Upon examining those lists which afford the clearest information as to numbers, it appears that thirteen dioceses return to their conferences in the whole about 1600 clergy and above 2200 laymen; so that if the thirty-two dioceses were included we should find their representatives to be about 4000 clergy and 6000 laity, including great numbers of nobles and important officials. And these

conferences, which are generally adopted, thus bring the whole mind of the Church of England to bear on the questions continually arising, and on works of practical utility. The movement will no doubt become more efficient with additional experience, but it gives the Church what it had so long needed—a voice in the management of its affairs, and a voice which will have more and more weight; for "union is strength," and the Church is rising into her proper position.

It has been proposed, and no doubt the proposal will take effect in time, that a General Council should be established to represent all the Diocesan Conferences, and bring their united strength to bear on questions affecting the Church. It is difficult to calculate the effects which such a concentration of the laity and clergy may hereafter have. Perhaps in times of danger before us, when all institutions may be shaken to their centre, it may furnish a rallying-point to the endangered cause of religion. It will be well to have the Church of England knit into one body. We see the effects of concentration in other communions.

CHAPTER III.

REVIVAL OF PASTORAL DILIGENCE AND OF THE CHURCH.

But these synodal movements of the Church of England would have been ineffectual had they not rested on vigorous manifestations of the Church's vitality in all directions. When we commenced in 1833 to stir in the Church's behalf, we soon ascertained the cordial fidelity of Churchmen, both clergy and laity, to the Church of England. That affection has never grown chill. It is now what it was then, but animated with fresh life and power. And here I would refer with thankfulness to the marvellous revival of pastoral zeal and vigilance which has manifested itself in the English Church and all its branches during the last half-century. And this I conceive arose in a great degree from the example set by one who was raised up by Divine Providence to be a shining light of the Church—Samuel Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford.

I must confess that for many years I did not feel any confidence in Wilberforce. He seemed to me to court popularity too much—to be willing to become "all things to all men" too far; to make the world too much the object of his admiration. I could not depend on his principles; it seemed as if they were always uncertain; but at last all these objections were swept away by the contemplation of his truly magnificent course of exertion in the cause of the

Church of England; the matchless energy which he displayed in carrying out all the duties of his high calling, nay, in surpassing them, in a flood of zeal such as I believe has never been equalled. The labours of Wilberforce were such as no words can describe. They were rather those of angelic force than human. Time and space seemed nothing to this extraordinary man; he would be in the evening hundreds of miles away from the scene of his morning labours, still occupied in his great work of preaching the Gospel, after having spoken and preached in numerous places on the way. His life is an astonishing example of what Christianity is capable when it is influenced by right and enlightened views of duty.

Bishop Wilberforce (whom I did not know) not only afforded a grand example of what Christianity can do, but he electrified the whole Church by it. He stirred it up to new life. There was not a bishop, or a parish priest, or a canon, or a curate who did not feel to his inmost heart the mighty impulse which Wilberforce gave to good works—to the whole Christian body; and they all acted accordingly. They took the contagion, and followed the bright example. They, too, laboured in season and out of season to bring home the blessed truths of Christianity to their people, and were foremost in all good works. These were the men who were unwearied in their exertions to do good in their generation; and as the result the whole tone and character of ministerial duty and obligation were suddenly raised in England, and the whole Church put on a new life.

It was not merely the construction and repair of churches (which became a national passion) that is here to be noticed. It became a necessity—a mere matter of course, deserving no particular remark—when churches suddenly made their appearance in every part of the country. On this subject I shall speak hereafter.

Bishop Wilberforce seems to me to have had a greater influence in reviving the Church of England than any of his contemporaries. Newman's work while he was a believing member of the Church of England, i.e. till about the year 1840, was extraordinary. The mode in which he popularized Church principles, and adapted them to intelligent minds, had in its train deep and widespread effects. I think that he put before men a set of principles so true in themselves that even he himself was not able to eradicate them in his later years; that his secession only left his original teaching of the Church's system undisturbed and strong enough to withstand all his efforts from the Roman communion to destroy it. So that to Newman we may ascribe the original awakening of the Church of England by the Oxford movement. Even his excesses in some points, and his mistakes in others, did not impede the progress of the revival. He threw himself into the breach, and often made mistakes, or inculcated dangerous notions, but he made the world listen to him; and perhaps a less daring and even rash movement, might not have awakened and startled the world, and made way for the reception of the solid truths which he inculcated; and when Newman abandoned his work in despair, others stepped in to complete and expand it.

Newman's teaching had been too theoretical; there was too much of speculation and of controversy in it to fit it for permanency. But as it fell, a more practical and beneficial agency arose, which taking what was good and true in Newman's system, and accordant with the Church of England, placed those principles in a higher and nobler and more practical attitude. As it was said of Saul, "He hath slain his thousands," but David "his tens of thousands," so it was in this case. Newman laid the foundation, but Wilberforce built up the temple. Wilberforce realized in the face of the world, high and

low, the true ideal of a Christian episcopate in the Church of England—a model which was to furnish an example to all ages of the Church; but never to be rivalled or approached again. Wilberforce's work was exactly what we needed. It was the combination of the practical with the theoretical. It tended to lead men away from barren and unfruitful controversies and mutual misunderstandings, to a holier emulation—rivalry in good works, rivalry in faith, rivalry in fidelity to the Church, rivalry in doing the work of Christ on earth, rivalry in saving souls.

The vast growth of the Church exhibits itself in varied forms, but especially in the changed position of the clergy in their own parishes. Half a century since the clergyman stood alone—the sole representative of religion in the parish. His duties lay in the administration of the sacraments and rites, preaching, performing divine service, and visiting the sick. Now all is changed, wherever it is possible for the clergyman to obtain help (and there are, of course, districts where the clergy cannot obtain helpers; but elsewhere the clergyman does not stand alone), he is surrounded by ready and willing assistants in all grades of life. He is aided perhaps by three or four curates, through various societies and organizations; and those curates multiply services in mission chapels. He has the aid of deaconnesses, or mission women, or sisters, who devote their time to works of mercy and charity, and influence the poor to practical religion and attendance at church. He has numbers of visiting ladies and laymen visitors, endeavouring to aid his people in all temporal and spiritual matters. Societies of all kinds for religious objects surround him, and court his advice and aid. Charitable institutions under his patronage abound. He has to plead the cause of the local charities, and of all the great societies of the Church, and to obtain funds for their support and increase. Perhaps

the population of his parish doubles or trebles in a few years, and he is enabled to establish missions to gather in the people, or to build new churches, and see them endowed by Church organizations, or served by additional curates. He is called upon to superintend and maintain extensive schools, often in order to prevent his people from being led astray to Infidelity, Romanism, or Dissent. In every direction his labours are increased enormously; but with the increased labour has come help—wide and general—often from distant quarters; and he is enabled to do a great work, amidst great self-denial, perhaps distress, and many severe trials.

It would be in vain to attempt an enumeration of all the works now going on quietly in parishes, under the direction of the clergy—works of which the world knows nothing beyond the limits of the parish. I will merely mention the works going on in one metropolitan parish, the report of which now lies before me. (1) The whole machinery for confirmation, including classes in which young and old are prepared; (2) instruction classes, in which the Scriptures are taught and good books circulated; (3) provident clubs; (4) working classes, in which the poor are taught habits of industry; (5) the parochial mission, for the conversion of the ignorant and those out of the way; (6) a society for aid during illness; (7) a society for visiting the poor, and aiding their distress; (8) a society for aiding church singing; (9) guilds for men, and for the old, and for young women, and their religious welfare; (10) mothers' meetings, for the study of good books; (11) dispensaries and aid for the sick; (12) societies of district visitors and their meetings; (13) meetings of school teachers and Sunday-school teachers; (14) ragged and night schools, and their support; (15) the soup kitchen for the poor; (16) society for "waifs and strays," or children deserted by

their parents; (17) working men's benefit societies; (18) multitudinous Christian charities supported by endowment or subscriptions; (19) needlework societies; (20) penny banks; (21) the young men's friendly society, for promoting wholesome amusement for Sunday evenings; (22) the junior guild, a branch of the same; (23) the confraternity of communicants to promote reverent and frequent communion; (24) the young women's friendly society, to unite those who wish to lead a Christian life; (25) the Church of England Temperance Society; (26) the Society in Aid of the Propagation of the Gospel. Such are the works going on quietly and unostentatiously in one church.

It is most touching to visit one of these churches where the work of good is going on, and to mark what is seen there; to mark the deep and hearty piety which is all around; the cordiality in response and singing; the unfeigned reverence. There are, of course, differences. There are churches where there is a want of life. There are churches where the clergy are not aided by zealous and intelligent laymen or other assistants. But all who see the working of the Church amidst large populations, where its energies are put forth, will confess the grand work which the Church of England is doing. It is augmenting day by day. The time of the clergy is engrossed; they feel that the care of the individual soul is the centre of their labours—that the great question is, "Are you in the way to everlasting life?"

Such is the noble but despised work which is being carried on in the Church of England—the evidence and result of its revived life. And never, perhaps, at any period of her history has the Church stood so strong in the affections of the people as at this moment, or more deservedly so. For the Gospel is indeed being manfully preached to the people; and every day tells of some

fresh work directed to their edification, and most gratefully received. There is every possible encouragement to Christians to go forth without fear, and preach the Gospel to the poor, and make fresh inroads into the realms of darkness; for the way is open, and the Divine blessing may be confidently relied on.

The Church of England may reckon for twenty years to come on the great opportunities of converting the poor which now exist. Perhaps no longer time can be reckoned on with certainty. For twenty years, however, the Church, though perhaps injured in some ways by the temporal power, will probably be able to hold her own, and continue undisturbed her great work. Preaching to the poor—to the ignorant and those out of the way, as it was her first work, so it should be her last—that with which she will meet Christ at His second coming. In coming times, religion may remain with those who are henceforth to be brought to it. It is they perhaps who will constitute the future inheritors of the earth, when those who are now high may be brought low. The Church is more and more alive to this part of her duty, and may be expected to fulfil it thoroughly.

But to revert to the Church as now existing. The ministry of the Church, as I have said, occupies an entirely different place now from what it did half a century since. In the first place we have seen the numbers of clergy and churches doubled; and the whole increase has been thrown into the manufacturing districts and the towns and centres of population. This vast increase has been brought about partly by the thousands of endowments provided by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners out of the estates of the suppressed sinecures, of which I have formerly spoken. But nine tenths of the endowments have been provided by the voluntary subscriptions of the members of the Church of England, in aid of the Commissioners; representing

vast sums—many millions sterling. The benefices have risen from about 9000 or 10,000 to 18,000, and are continually augmenting; and there are 6000 curates as assistants. In addition to the schoolmasters who are assistants of the clergy, and may perhaps be reckoned at 30,000, the Church Sunday-schools in two-thirds of the parishes (all that have made returns) provide no less than 113,000 teachers inculcating the religion of the Church of England in above 16,000 schools; while the Church, in the vast educational system which it maintains, has been expending by subscriptions and payments of its members, 1,200,000*l.* a year.

Great numbers of curates are provided by voluntary subscriptions through the Church Pastoral Aid Society, and the Curates' Aid Society; and church building and repairing have assumed astonishing dimensions. In the course of the last half-century there is hardly a church in England that has not been restored, rebuilt, enlarged, or placed in effective repair. Many thousands are expended on a single church. The number of new churches probably doubles the old list, and as regards the populous districts they have trebled in numbers. As far as I can estimate, from the "Guide to the Churches of London and its Vicinity," there are in the metropolitan districts fully three churches for one that existed before the movement of 1833. They have been built partly with the aid of the Church Building Society, in whose favour the crown, according to ancient custom, issued a letter yearly for collections in the churches, but which, through the malignity of the Church's enemies, was withdrawn; though the collections were only made in the established churches and chapels; and the Society was thus deprived of 50,000*l.* per annum.

Nevertheless the work of church building has not been interrupted, and we may say that no country in the world

can exhibit so prodigious a multitude of new churches raised by the zeal of Churchmen. This most necessary work was greatly promoted by the energies of the late Dr. Blomfield, Bishop of London, who found that great city in a frightful state of spiritual want, destitute of churches and of clergy. By his well-directed exertions a vast sum of money was raised by subscription to provide the means of religious instruction for the people of the metropolis; and this sum having been expended, to the great relief of the metropolitan needs, the late Dr. Tait, upon his appointment to the See of London, set on foot another fund, which has also been productive of vast benefit, and has besides provided a large body of spiritual labourers in the metropolitan districts.

This expansion of the Church of England in the last fifty years has been something wonderful. It is so vast that it is difficult to take it in. The multitudes of new societies for religious purposes in the Church of England, all of the most practical nature, and imperatively called for, show the amazing wants of the Church and the willingness to supply them. It would take up many pages to mention these institutions. They will be found generally in the "Church Year Book," published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

It may be observed that this ancient Church society, together with the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, the Tract Society, and the Church Missionary Society (all Church of England societies), with many others, have taken a new lease of life, and become more and more vigorous as time advances.

We must not leave out the salutary measures which have been from time to time adopted for the suppression of pluralities, thereby increasing the number of incumbents; the removal of non-residence; the division of parishes and formation of new districts; the erection of

houses of residence, and advance of the necessary funds; and other material aids and appliances, which have all been contemporaneous with the general growth of the Church of England.

Nor has this grand revival been limited to the Church in England; it has overflowed beneficially on all the sister and daughter Churches beyond the limits of England. Their growth has been marvellous. Fifty years since, the Colonial Church was ruled by about half a dozen bishops. The number is now more than ten times as great. And here it is impossible to avoid mentioning the honoured name of Blomfield, Bishop of London, who devoted his life with rare energy, forethought, and skill to his work, and to the maintenance of sound principles; by whose able conduct of business and excellent sense the cause of Church extension in England was greatly advanced; and to whom the formation of the episcopate in the English colonies may be ascribed. The Bishop founded a Society for the increase of the Colonial Episcopate which still exists, and which has been the means of increasing the number of colonial bishops from about six to the number of eighty, each of whom has been a centre for the expansion of the Church over which he presides. At the same time the American Church, stimulated by the example of England, has exerted itself so vigorously that its bishops have multiplied to the number of seventy, from three or four; and the whole Communion, which half a century since numbered about fifty dioceses and bishops, has, notwithstanding the suppression of half of the Irish Episcopate in 1833, increased to the number of 220 bishops, exclusive of those of Sweden. Such has been the result of Bishop Blomfield's exertions, which entitle him to rank amongst the greatest benefactors of the Church of England.

Another of the greatest ornaments of the Church who

was raised up at this period to revivify and set an example to the whole Communion, was George Selwyn, Bishop and Metropolitan of New Zealand, the great missionary of the East, whose astonishing labours in the cause of Christ reminded us of the Apostle Paul himself; and who stamped the spirit of all his proceedings upon the whole Church, at home and abroad. Nor will his heroic exertions on behalf of Christianity ever fail to animate the faith in all parts of the world.

Nor must I here pass over in silence one other great name—ever to be held in reverence by all who love the faith once delivered to the saints—Gray, Bishop of Capetown and Metropolitan of Africa. This true and faithful confessor of the faith; this modern Athanasius; who testified against a greater infidelity than Arianism, and who suffered obloquy, enmity, and desertion for the sake of Christ, will be found high in the firmament of the worthies of the English Church when Christ shall appear on earth. That most courageous and most faithful of God's servants, neglected and despised by many, will hear those words, "Well done, good and faithful servant. Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." The desertion of such a man by some, who should have stood firm in his support, was almost enough to shake the faith of the members of the Church of England; but they were reassured by the moral support rendered to Christian belief by the unanimous voice of the whole reformed episcopate, and by the steps taken to clear the Church from all complicity with infidelity.

With such bright examples before us, the Church of England may well take courage, in the trust, that of a truth God is with us; that He is guarding amongst us the precious deposit of Christianity. We feel in contemplating them, that, notwithstanding the withdrawal of the temporal Government from the Church's cause, and

notwithstanding the vehement and increasing opposition which the Church has experienced in some quarters; and notwithstanding the internal disputes which have left her open to attack,—that in spite of all, her success has been astonishing and unprecedented. We see no such case anywhere. Assuredly then, the Lord is our supporter. And here let me note one characteristic of this great movement of the Church. It is free from bigotry and uncharitableness. There are communities styled Christian which seek to gain converts from the Church, by pretending that to remain in her is to incur loss of salvation. Such is the established position of Roman controversialists. They teach that no one can be saved out of the Pope's communion. Individuals may explain away this intolerant view, but it is practically universal. And again, there are those who feel it right to create a spirit of hatred and personal jealousy and envy against the Church, as if the success of her exertions on behalf of Christ deserved to be matter of offence; and on these grounds they induce men to forsake her communion. But the Church of England herself acts differently. That Church is absorbed in the great work of making the English nation faithful to God and to Jesus Christ, and overcoming evil with good; and has little time to engage in controversies with its opponents. It hurls no condemnations against Papal adherents; does not pronounce them lost, though it points out the errors into which they have fallen; for we acknowledge that Romanists have not, as a Church, denied the cardinal articles of the faith. Other enemies it meets by yielding to unmerited obloquy; hoping that by good works it may put to silence the enmity of some, and that its adhesion to God's cause will be eventually acknowledged. If not, then the will of God is to be done.

Amongst the marks of the general progress of the

Church we have to notice the altered tone and work of the cathedrals. Instead of being left deserted, as was the case not many years since, with cold services, to which cathedral music formed the only attraction, they are now attended by crowded congregations. They are becoming centres of spiritual life. They are attended by devout worshippers, and services have been multiplied in an extraordinary way. They are becoming models and examples to the Church, instead of being far in the rear; a source of strength instead of weakness; a powerful means of winning the people to the cause of religion.

Another great movement was brought about by the necessities of the times. The supply of clergy threatened to fall short through the organization and aggressions of infidelity, especially in Oxford and Cambridge. But thereupon the Church, besides establishing the University of Durham, founded no less than fourteen training or theological colleges, which provide for the instruction of candidates for holy orders, and furnish an important addition to their numbers; so that the supply of candidates for holy orders has by no means diminished. In counteraction also of the Rationalistic principles so widely disseminated by Oxford and London professors (and which have acquired establishment by the measures of the Legislature for revolutionizing the religious character of the Universities), the Church has established fresh colleges at Oxford and Cambridge based on Christian principles, and will doubtless, as time advances, make more effectual provision for the maintenance of Christianity in the Universities.

Nor can I here omit the remarkable evidence of progress presented by the recent establishment of new bishoprics. England was long the country in Europe in which the episcopal office was the most overburdened; and during the present century, the population having doubled

or trebled, the number of bishoprics was out of all proportion to the wants of the people. To correspond with other countries the bishoprics needed to be doubled or trebled. It was in vain, however, that the Church asked for an increase. The late Lord Lyttelton was its prominent advocate, and through his exertions Sir Richard Cross (one of the ministers) at length carried a bill for the foundation of six new sees. This, though far short of what was needed, was a great relief to the Churches, though coupled with the condition that the Church must find the funds for endowing the new sees. Four bishoprics have been already established, the Church of England in each case subscribing about 100,000*l.* to provide the endowment; and the others are in progress.

This erection of new sees is a test of the vitality of a system, which is not presented by any other country in the world at present. It is one of those minor points in the movement of the Church of England, that is almost unnoticed in the prodigious and unexampled progress of the Church.

Amongst the signs of growing life in the Church must be mentioned a comparatively modern institution, the hint for which was partly supplied by Wesleyan Methodism and other forms of Dissent, grounded on the similar practice of the Church of Rome. The Church is not too proud to learn from any quarter. I refer more particularly to the institution of parochial missions. They began about A.D. 1863, and arose chiefly from the missionary labours of the Rev. Robert Aitkin. A great work was set on foot by him in 1873 in combination with the London Church Mission for converting the ungodly; and the Diocesan Home Missionary Society was first established in the Diocese of Lichfield. Such societies have risen in numerous parts. Their action is to carry out a systematic course of preaching, teaching, and devotion

for several days, under the ablest preachers of the time, for the instruction and reclamation of those who have hitherto been inattentive to the calls of religion, and of the lukewarm members of the Church; and this systematic and affectionate appeal to the inhabitants of each locality in turn, has often produced surprising effects in reviving the religious sentiment, and in producing lasting effects for good. It seems one of the most effective instruments for reviving the Church and rendering it a reality.

CHAPTER IV.

ADVERSE CIRCUMSTANCES.

In the preceding chapter I have endeavoured to embody an outline of the great and extraordinary exertions of the Church of England to accomplish its work, and advance the cause of Christ. It is, I am sensible, very imperfect; for it is indeed most difficult to realize the greatness of the work which has been accomplished, and is now in hand, and daily progressing. God has given to His chosen Church the gift of faith and of perseverance. I would not consciously exaggerate in the faintest degree the real work of the Church, or lead others to form exaggerated estimates or ill-founded hopes. The Church has undoubtedly been wonderfully supported. But the support is only the more wonderful, because it has been given amidst difficulties and trials which to many would seem almost insurmountable, and beneath which I have often myself been almost in despair.

What could be more distressing than the rupture of that ancient alliance between Church and State on which the Church had so long depended, to which she clung to the last, believing that a principle which had raised the House of Hanover to the throne would not be violated? What could be more distressing than to see the governing classes of this country forming an alliance

with the Papacy, and opening the way to its incessant attacks upon the Church of England?

What could be more alarming than the spread of revolutionary principles in religion, threatening the destruction of our creeds and ritual? What was more alarming than a Parliament willing to abandon our essential institutions? What could be more miserable than the suppression of half the episcopate, in order to gratify the enemies of the Church? What could be more alarming than the systematic spread of Rationalism, under the highest patronage; and as the consequence, the open avowal of infidelity in God's written word? What could be worse than the systematic and successful efforts to un-Christianize the Universities, and open them to any and to no creed—the systematic attempts to deprive the Church of the Christian education of her children, and to create a population destitute of religion? What more distressing than to see the upper classes becoming in many instances a prey to Romish deceits and infidel science? In every direction Christianity has been assailed for a long series of years; assailed in the most vital points, by deadly enemies who have sought nothing less than its absolute perdition; and they have been often and largely successful—they have inflicted deep wounds on the Church's cause; but in spite of all, the Church has never been so flourishing.

The Church of England is continually engaged in aggression, I admit; but it is aggression on the kingdom and rule of Satan—not on any Christian Church or denomination. If there be any who succeed in bringing human beings from under the dominion of sin, who restore them to the knowledge and love of God, we hail them as fellow-workers in the same cause. We have to speak of those who are at variance with the Church, either apparently or really; and in treating of these obstacles in the way of the Church

of England, and the difficulties which present themselves in consequence, we shall have to notice four subjects.

I. Dissent.
II. Romanism.
III. Infidelity.
IV. Ritualism.

I. We have first to treat on Dissent. And here it is a source of joy to remember, that if communion is interrupted between the Church and those who call themselves Presbyterians, Nonconformists, Wesleyans, and others, there is at least a substantial unity upon the great articles of religion. The Nonconformists and Wesleyans are one with us, in confessing the inspiration of the same Scriptures, worshipping the same God, and the same Lord Jesus Christ, and the same Spirit; looking for salvation to the same Christ; in short, believing all that the Apostles delivered to the Church in the Creed. We may regard them so far as brethren in the common faith; and in the latter days, when the grand principles of religion are openly and daringly denied by wicked men, it is with deep gratitude that we confess, that amidst the divisions which have unhappily occurred, the people of England and Scotland, of whatever denomination, are faithful adherents of the cardinal doctrines of Christianity. And that truth implies much. It implies that since they have received baptism and the spiritual privilege which it implies of being members of Christ's Church; and as they maintain those articles of the faith necessary to salvation, and as they have not themselves broken communion with the Church, but have accidentally and through the action of their forefathers become outwardly separated from the Church, they may still be acknowledged as virtual members of the Church, and admitted to its privileges, unless they should incur actual schism by their conduct and proceedings. But according to my

experience this is often not the case, Nonconformists ordinarily merely following the religion of their fathers, without any feeling of hostility to the Church. Of their teachers I cannot make the same remark.

It should seem indeed, that as regards many of the Nonconformists, the spirit of hostility to the Church of England has so far diminished, that if such were the general feeling, a reunion of the communions might not be impossible; for the Church of England, by the new institution of lay readers now prevalent in most of our dioceses, concedes to laymen nominated by the bishops the power to catechize, read the Scriptures, visit the sick, and in effect perform many parts of the ministerial office; and would no doubt be prepared to make further concessions (saving essential principles) in the event of restoration of unity; but though the door is open, there seems no prospect of the guests entering in, for it is easier to make divisions than to heal them; especially where on one side there is no appreciation of the evil of division in the Christian body, or of its wrongness.

One great characteristic of these separated communities is repugnance to Romanism. It is a matter of rejoicing that there is such a feeling amongst them, and I for one should be sorry to see it diminish. It is one of those safeguards of Reformation principles in the Church of England for which we should be grateful. One of the strongest points upon which Dissent has rested, has been the tendency of Newman and his disciples towards Rome, and their actual fall, and the assertion that similar principles prevail in the Church. We may say, that the Dissenting argument depends on this misstatement, or exaggeration, at present.

We have seen considerable alteration in the argument for Nonconformity. Until two generations since, at the beginning of this century, Nonconformity retained the

principles which originally led to secession from the Church of England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The Calvinistic discipline or the independency of Churches was held to be of Divine right, and therefore Episcopacy was intolerable. The settled liturgy and ritual of the Church was unlawful and Popish. Bishops and the surplice were rags of Popery. Equality of ministers and ruling elders was divinely instituted. These doctrines at length went out of fashion, and about the beginning of this century were superseded by another doctrine. It was declared that any support of the Church by the State was anti-Christian. This was a complete reversal of former principles; for the elder Puritans and Nonconformists all maintained that it was the duty of the State to establish their system in lieu of that of the Church. However, State support of the Church was now vehemently denounced as anti-Christian. After several years, however, this became obsolete, and a new mode of reasoning was devised, founded on the excesses of the Tractarian party, and the secession of their leaders. "Here," they said, "is the effect of being Churchmen. The Church is a mere nursery for Rome." The argument was plausible: it was not seen that the Church is the great opponent of Rome, the great object of its hatred. The fall of a few unsettled men into Romanism was sufficient to damn the immense community from which they seceded. On the same ground the Church might be accused of infidelity or of Darbyism, or of heresy of any kind, because a few men have lapsed into those errors. Above twenty thousand clergy were accused of Popery, because fifty men were led astray by a teacher. Accusations of this kind may answer their purpose for a moment, but in the long-run their fallacy appears. They cannot do any harm to Churchmen, who know the real state of the case; but with Nonconformists they may have much effect.

The "Liberation Society," which is the form that the Dissenting organization has taken, knowing that the direct overthrow and plunder of the Church was what the nation would not approve of, has professed to be actuated by the greatest friendliness to the Church. Its only object was to promote the progress of the Church! It merely sought to free the Church from State control, by confiscating its possessions, somewhat like the polite footpad who "relieves" the traveller of the weight of his purse!

As far as argument is concerned the Liberationists have little to boast of, and the Church little to fear; but the political influence which a political organization is in England able to bring to bear, through the influence it exercises over voters, is a wholly different thing. It is one of those dangers which the Church must contemplate in the future, inasmuch as it is ably directed by unscrupulous and irreligious or bigoted men, and directly influences large classes who possess political power in the Government or otherwise, and is prepared to make common cause with Popery and infidelity for the accomplishment of its designs. It is steadfast, unflinching, unvarying in its enmity to the Church, and to every Act of Parliament in its favour.

It is one of those dangers from the effects of which God alone can protect us, as He has hitherto done. We are without political power to oppose to it. Nevertheless, we still trust in His aid to bring to naught the councils of the enemy. As to Nonconformists generally, I trust that we shall more and more have their support in the maintenance of vital doctrines, and against the designs of Rome. It is time for Christians to close their ranks when they are in the presence of common enemies.

In what has been said of Dissent I do not mean to include Wesleyanism, which, though separated from our

communion, is engaged in promoting practical religion, and carries out in all respects the system of its excellent founder, save in the one point of separation from the Church of England, which, however, is usually not carried as far as open hostility to the Church.

II. We have next to consider the dangers to the Church arising from the Church of Rome. The English clergy and people, including the whole body of Nonconformists of all denominations, are as thoroughly opposed to Romanism, its claims and its attempts, as they ever have been. They may be tolerant, and refrain from the use of strong language, but they remain what they were at the time of the Reformation as regards their objection to Romanism. Of course persons may be found who despise all religious differences, and such persons very naturally ridicule all objections to Romanism, and, in fact, believe nothing. It is a part of the Jesuit policy to influence the newspaper press. Accordingly, a certain proportion of the articles are evidently written by Roman Catholics, and intended to sing the praises and promote the cause of their system. They side with the Pope and the Ultramontane party, and run down whatever these disapprove of. In fact the newspaper press in England is often more favourable to the Papal claims and objects than the foreign Roman Catholic press, and the letters from foreign correspondents to English journals are largely written by Roman Catholics of the Ultramontane school. Nevertheless, these open advocates of the Papal cause produce, I apprehend, but little effect on the nation. They are seen to be what they are—Roman Catholic advertisements. And, after all, allusions and talk of this kind do not make converts. Englishmen are not to be converted by newspaper talk, even if it be used to puff all the proceedings of the Pope, the priests, or lay Roman Catholics—praising its converts, or belauding the Jesuits or the monks and nuns whom they

direct. These articles are compelled to be written with such caution, in order not to offend the English ear, that they cannot produce any effect on the reason or conscience, and this part of the labour of Rome produces little result.

When, again, Romanism comes to be a matter of argument, the only great point made—and made purely by loud assertion—is that there is no rational or intelligible alternative between infidelity and extreme Ultramontanism. The want of proof for this is made up for by loud assertion. Proof is never attempted, but it is hoped that people will be imposed upon by oracular statements. One would think that this open harmony of principle between infidelity and Romanism might lead the latter to doubt whether all can be safe when it finds itself in the same boat with infidelity, urging men to become unbelievers in Christ rather than to disbelieve the Pope. The Church of England need not have a moment's fear of such a system as this, which presents unbelief in God as a rational alternative to the mind, and acknowledges Romanism to be the only other alternative. Romanism is allied with infidelity in these latter days, and will not prevail against Christianity. We may rely on the Divine protection for the faith.

It is the policy of Rome to destroy faith when it seeks to make converts. It was by sceptical argument that the Jesuits succeeded in making converts in Germany in the last generation. They proved that Christian belief has no rational basis, and thence argued that the claims of Rome should be blindly received. The Romish argument is always based on infidelity—on a denial of the rational evidences of Christianity; and it has accordingly converted the majority of men in Roman continental countries into infidels.

It is natural, therefore, that it should sympathize as it does with infidelity; and so the world accepts their joint

assertions, and believes that it must be the height of folly to believe in the rational evidences of Christianity, because Romanists and infidels agree that they are of no value—that is, that they themselves will not accept them.

To establish the rational basis of Christianity—to defend its evidences as Churchmen do, is at the same moment to upset the whole argumentative system of Romanism and infidelity. The moment that Christianity is proved to have a rational foundation they are utterly defeated and annihilated. This fact, when it is realized, ought to be an armour of proof to the Christian. It should show him that Ultramontanism is working for the same end as infidelity; that it is as hostile in reality to true religion as infidelity itself; and that Christianity is destined to prevail against it.

The Roman Catholic theology, up to the period when the Oxford movement commenced (1833), was Gallican in all parts of Europe except at Rome. Gallican principles were avowed by the Roman Catholic bishops, priests, and laity until the grant of Emancipation.[1] They openly rejected the infallibility and deposing power of the Pope, and other tenets of Ultramontanism. They openly avowed doctrines now condemned as heresy in the Church of Rome. It was such principles as these that we used to have to deal with, and upon their open and repeated confession the Roman Catholics were emancipated in 1829.

As soon as they had gained the power of returning members to Parliament they adopted a different tone. Ultramontane principles which they had formally rejected became universally received, together with all their consequences; and the understanding on which emancipation had been granted was violated.

We then had by degrees to deal with a system which,

[1] See the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone's tracts, "Rome and the Newest Fashions in Religion."

repudiating its former Gallicanism, had become wholly Ultramontane; i.e. a system which denies the Gallican principle of appealing to Scripture and Christian antiquity, and the authority of the universal Church, against Papal absolutism. But in taking up this position the Papal advocates destroyed entirely the appeal to facts; that is, the historical evidence of Christianity. Accordingly, the advocates of this modern system of Rome refuse all appeal to the Scriptures, alleging that, except upon the Pope's authority, they are of uncertain authority and meaning.

They have no scruple in arguing against them, making use of all the objections of infidels as valid; and they appear side by side with infidelity, attacking the Christian evidences.

Such was for many years, till after 1870, the unvarying course of Roman theology. All the old controversial treatises of the Papal schools were antiquated, and theology had to be written anew, on Ultramontane principles. The Jesuits triumphed, and the Gallicans were condemned as heretics.

But later on we saw the Church of Rome revolving on its axis, and while professing the Ultramontane belief, and the decree of the Vatican synod on Papal infallibility, so professing them as to destroy them. For the doctrine of Minimism, adopted by Newman from Bishop Fessler, and for which he was rewarded with a cardinal's hat, and hailed by English Romanists as the saviour of the Roman Catholic cause in England, gives liberty to the theologian to examine whether the Papal decree on any given point is or is not infallible; that is, whether it does or does not comply with certain arbitrary conditions of infallibility, laid down by private judgment, and not by infallibility. If it does not meet these conditions, it is declared to be not binding on belief. Consequently, the individual theologian's own judgment is the real ultimate test, and the

Papal infallibility becomes a name.[2] The appeal of the theologian is nominally to the Papacy; but really to his own judgment of what the Christian doctrine, taught by the Scriptures and the Church, has been; and thus Gallicanism, cloaked under the profession of Ultramontanism reappears upon the scene; and is at once accepted by two Popes in succession, and by the whole Church of Rome. Thus Gallicanism, after being displaced for about forty years, appears once more, under the auspices of Cardinal Newman, and has held its ground ever since, with Papal approbation.

A system so self-contradictory as the Roman, is one from which English Christianity has nothing to dread on the score of argument. All that can be wished is, that the readers of Roman controversy may have sufficient patience and penetration to trace sophisms to their sources, and not to accept without critical examination any assertion, argument, or extract; especially inquiring whether the latter is from genuine or spurious works.

But though the Roman system is weak and inconsistent in argument, and proves on close examination to rest upon mere assumptions, yet Romanism is a formidable opponent of truth, through the utter unscrupulousness with which it pursues its ends towards gaining dominion in England, to the exclusion of every other system, under the firm belief that in no other system but its own is salvation attainable. For this purpose it expends enormous sums of money, and especially seeks for rich and aristocratic converts, in order to obtain funds. Upon England, too, it expends funds drawn from all Roman Catholic countries; and with these combined resources is able to multiply priests, monks, nuns, chapels, cathedrals, and all other means of conversion, more rapidly

[2] See the subject more fully discussed in "Results of the Expostulation," by Umbra Oxoniensis (the author). King and Co.

than in any Roman Catholic country. It succeeds in making converts among the aristocracy and upper classes; though their number is small in proportion to the whole, and is falling off.

It steadily and uniformly seeks the destruction of the Church of England, spiritually and temporally; and with this object adopts a mixture of force and conciliation in the use of its strong political influence over the English Government. In Ireland it attempts to carry its objects by force and intimidation, and to expel Protestantism by persecution and legislation. In England it flatters the Government, and seeks to gain its ends by posing as the friend of order and loyalty. The policy of Pius IX. rules in Ireland, that of Leo XIII. in England. Both have influenced, and will hereafter influence, the English Government, which has for the last half-century been without religious principles, and has habitually disregarded religious considerations, and been guided by temporal policy. A Government like the English is no match for Roman policy. It is not hostile to the Church, it is only indifferent. But as the Roman Catholics are so organized politically that they possess fifty votes, which act always against the Church, and for the advancement of Romanism; and as the Church has no similar body organized on her behalf; her interests are usually disregarded in the course of legislation, and those of the Papacy are promoted steadily.

Hence the last two Popes have on various occasions held up the conduct of the English Government to the highest praise, for not merely the most unbounded toleration of Roman Catholicism, but for its decided encouragement; and they have urged upon all Roman Catholic states to imitate the example of England, where more favour is shown to Romanism than in any Roman Catholic country.

All this, however, is the natural consequence of the policy adopted by Pitt at the beginning of the century, and by Peel in 1829; for conciliation to the Church of Rome means the grant of its demands; and therefore, as far as the English Government is concerned, we may expect to see the steady exaltation of Rome. It has recently gained what has been the grand and avowed object of the Papacy since the accession of the present Pontiff—restoration of diplomatic intercourse with the English Government; by which it will in future exercise secret influence upon that Government; and it has even managed so adroitly as to put Government under an obligation, and to induce it to place reliance upon the Papacy directly for the future government of Ireland. Romanism will next clamour for a Papal nuncio at the Court of St. James's, which some Government will grant; and then the claim will be put forward for freedom on the part of the sovereign to embrace the Roman Catholic religion, and afterwards for the abolition of the Protestant established Church and sects; and the burning of heretics. It will be said that such things are impracticable: they may be so to some extent; but they are the objects of Romanism, and the English Government will promote them, in consequence of the return of Roman Catholic members by the Papal priesthood in Ireland.

There is, however, one element in the case which will exercise, as it has done, some counteracting influence,—I mean the people of England, Wales, and Scotland. They have certain principles, and those principles are adverse to Popery, and I am persuaded that their feeling is such, and the danger of irritating it too much is still so far apprehended by politicians, that it may be hoped that the progress gained by Rome, through English ministries, may be but slow; nor do I apprehend much from this source for twenty years, when the state of things may be

more dangerous to the Church of Rome than to the Church of England.

The Church of Rome has considerably increased in England during the past half-century. Its English adherents indeed are so few, that if they stood alone, Romanism would be the smallest sect in this country. But it has received an accession of a million and upwards of Irish immigrants brought over by the manufacturers. This immigration is incapable of producing any effect on the religion of the country. It is not dangerous to the Church, it is only so to social order. It forms part of the Fenian population of Ireland, with which it entirely sympathizes; and as we see in the case of Nihilism, Communism, Socialism, and other forms of the same anarchical system, society has as much to fear as religion from its enterprises. England already possesses revolutionary elements enough; and should they ever be combined with Fenianism, the result may be like the combination of those explosive substances in which Fenianism delights. It is not then the Church which will suffer alone, if anarchical principles, in combination with Romanism, gain the ascendency; society and the Church of Rome itself will be equally the victims.

We might fear the tortuous policy pursued by the Jesuits and Papal proselytizers in making converts, and their utter unscrupulousness as to truth. And no doubt such reasoners occasionally succeed in particular cases. They "compass sea and land to make one proselyte," and they sometimes triumph; but it produces no perceptible effect, except that of causing stronger hostility to a system which can employ such means for its advancement; and the effect of these attempts is absolutely *nil*. The Church only becomes stronger and stronger; and Romanism has dwindled in the last thirty years from a third to a seventh of the population, including Ireland.

I am very far from supposing that the Papacy by means of its priesthood will not be found the active and energetic foe of the Church of England in coming times. It has great political power everywhere, by organization and combination and strong party spirit. It will succeed in many of its objects. The upper classes are apathetic; the ruling classes indifferent to religion. The Church will receive many a blow from the State. Even individuals in small numbers may hope to be able to induce the Parliament to break through the Church's laws of morality for their gratification. But the time may come when the upper classes, and the governing classes, and the monied classes, may repent their conduct towards religion and morality—when it is too late.

Their conduct, however, I am confident, will not induce the Church of England to abandon her principles, or to permit enmity or opposition to arrest for one hour the great career of zeal and fidelity in which the Church has been engaged. The advances of evil will, I am persuaded, only call for increased exertions for the cause of good, seeing that the Church is under trial by its God, whether in the midst of increasing temptations it will still prove faithful to Him.

If the Church of England has to share in the wreck of the institutions of this world—if the future is dark before her, as well as before the Church of Rome and its head, the Church of England will stand prepared for the shock, revived, strengthened, united, purified, able to stand the trial, and destined to become the great principle of union for future society, when the sorrows of death and calamity are over. She will rise again, to accomplish her great ends, and to endure for ever in the kingdom of Christ.

III. We have to consider the dangers of the Church arising from infidelity.

We must not suppose that infidelity is peculiar to the

present generation in England. The upper and middle classes were as much affected as they now are by Deism in the last century, which only differs in name from modern infidelity, producing the same effects, and equally allied with immorality; nay, more so. Nevertheless it entirely disappeared when the great events of the French Revolution taught men that there was a God, and that it was necessary to rely on His Providence. Excessive luxury and idleness, and their result, over-education and presumption, have created modern infidelity, as they created ancient sceptical philosophy, which was destined, like it, to be destroyed by more serious subjects of thought—by the destruction of the classes where infidelity finds support. Infidelity is doomed; and as infidel science once perished before, so will it perish again.

These vain men are ignorant that the Gospel was not addressed to the wise—the philosophers, the scientific; but to mankind—to the masses who know nothing of science or philosophy, and are incapable of comprehending them; and therefore that science and philosophy (though not always infidel) are not the medium through which God makes known His will to man; and that he who relies upon them for his faith upon religious subjects, is in the same predicament as one who should determine legal questions on the principles of metaphysics, or should cultivate his garden on the principles of conic sections. "Wise men" like these are incapable of comprehending that the Gospel was "preached to the poor" —that it ever can reach the poor. It is to be only the privilege of those wise and great men who delight in negations!

Happily the world in all ages has agreed in negativing the dicta of these wise men, and believing in a Creator and Ruler of the world. And that faith will not be overthrown by the efforts of modern infidelity (though in

England its recent utterances, from 1861, have been most elaborate and subtle; and often, if taken singly, would be unanswerable by most men); for they are completely at variance. This is a truth which has been ably brought out by the Archbishop of York, in his introduction to the "Speaker's Commentary on the Bible;" and it is to be wished that it should be pursued farther, and that the utter contradictions of infidelity in its various forms should be elucidated for the benefit of the English reader.

Christianity is in no degree unwilling to encounter these various antagonists of religion, as we may see satisfactorily exemplified in the labours of the Victoria Institute and the Christian Evidence Society; and through these means great success has been obtained in the conversion of those who have been deceived for a time; and these societies only need to be vigorously supported by pecuniary means, to achieve the most important results; particularly among working-men. Nor can it be doubted that the Church will feel it a bounden duty to support their cause.

Since 1861, when the infidel attacks commenced with the publication of "Essays and Reviews," Rationalism has rapidly deepened into Deism, then into open Atheism; and a whole infidel literature has been poured forth on England from the pens of many men, some of whom rank among the most eminent of the scientific of the day. And doubtless they have found an echo amongst some thousands of the wealthy and idle classes, who make it a rule to purchase every infidel book that appears. I trust, however, that these known infidel books are chiefly perused by unbelievers, and exercise little influence upon Christians generally, being adapted to the use of the educated only. Their perusal, when it does take place, often produces rather a weakness of principle, than an actual

conversion to infidelity; and it is counteracted by the simple exhibition of Christian faith and practice which is going on around them, and is thus neutralized. Persons thus slightly unsettled, are gradually influenced by the entire movement and faith of the Church, and fall into its practical system, and in the end become firm believers. We often see this beneficial influence imperceptibly exercised on those who originally were of unsettled principles, verging on scepticism. They come gradually to realize the force of truth, which had once been unfelt and unknown.

Amongst the advantages which infidelity has gained over the cause of religion, may be mentioned the endowment of an infidel lecture by Mr. Hibbert with large funds, which provide for the delivery and publication of infidel lectures in London. For the purpose of this attack on religion, lecturers are selected from the ablest infidel and Unitarian writers in England, and well-known infidels are brought over from the Continent, and scientific argument in all its shapes is brought to bear against the Christian revelation. Probably means will be found for dealing with this aggression on Christianity. It is probable, however, that its publications circulate only among unbelievers; but they are reproduced in the newspapers.

A more serious blow against religion has been given by the Government legislation, which has withdrawn the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge from the Church of England, to which the superior religious education of the young was always formerly confided. Carrying out the Government principle adopted in 1829, these institutions have been divested of a religious character, and all doctrines and infidelities may be taught there.

This has undoubtedly been a serious blow to Christianity;

but it has called forth great exertions to meet the danger by the institution of Christian colleges, and by the foundation of the theological colleges, and will doubtless lead to increased efforts; and in the meantime the general spread of Christianity by the Church, and its increasing vitality, will operate as a check on the designs of the enemy. If Satan is at work with all his energies, so the servants of Christ should be; and so they are. We have no reason to think that infidelity is gaining ground in England on the whole, notwithstanding its convulsive exertions. God will not permit it to go beyond the limits within which it is permitted to try the men of this generation. Its time approaches for judgment and destruction.

IV. And now I would say a few words on that which has been full of danger to the Church of England—the internal dissension in the Church in our own times, the contest about Ritualism. I shall only offer a few general considerations, avoiding the minute details of a difficult question.

I remember when, about 1845, Oakeley set on foot a Ritualistic system at Margaret Chapel before his secession to Rome; and on visiting his church I was astonished at its ceremonial, which appeared to exceed that of Romanism itself. Some years later, Ritualism began in the English Church by the adoption of the vestments by certain young men, and we heard of men adopting other customs from the Church of Rome, and sometimes in the face of strong opposition from their congregations, and of disapprobation from the bishops.

I deeply regretted these movements, which seemed to be dictated by indifference to the unity of the Church, and to be sometimes made as offensive as possible. I wrote against them in periodicals, and deprecated them as needlessly offensive. I should myself have been glad

to revive the vestments, from a wish to restore the customs of primitive antiquity, adopted in the universal Church. I would have revived the early forms of these vestments as represented in the "Origines Liturgicæ," and would have had them made of white linen only; but knowing that they were not necessary, I would not run the risk of causing division by adopting them.

In the excited state of the public mind, I thought their introduction a great imprudence. Nevertheless I heard at the time, that the great object of those who introduced this ceremonial was to draw the people to their churches by something new and unaccustomed. For at first there was no attempt to defend it by mystic and symbolic reasons, such as were afterwards adopted to meet the objections of adversaries. The object of drawing the people to divine service was certainly good.

Yet, when the Ritualists took up the ground of divine right, or symbolism, I disapproved it strongly; but I was not in favour of proceeding against those who introduced these changes in temporal courts; preferring spiritual courts, or convocation, or synods, which were allowed by the innovators to be the proper tribunal.

Lawsuits followed, in which one view of the case was determined by temporal judges, and then another. It appeared to me that temporal tribunals determining questions solely upon the principles of the common and statute law, were not adapted to the solution of the points involved. The Prayer Book was not compiled by lawyers, but by theologians, and was addressed, like the Gospel, to common-sense, and not to the interpretations of hair-splitting lawyers. It seemed to me that the latter might unintentionally (under the influence of political bias), by the application of entirely new principles of interpretation to certain rules, completely subvert the real meaning of those rules—that a committee even of intelligent laymen

of the Church of England would be a better qualified tribunal.

I wished that the Ritualists, imprudent and blameworthy as they were in some respects, should not have been judged by a committee of political lawyers, but by a committee of Churchmen impartially selected. On the other hand I could not but heartily sympathize with their opponents. They saw in the adoption of several practices common to Rome, a clear evidence of a Romish tendency in the Ritualists. They not unreasonably considered that those who introduced them were secretly favourable to Rome, and only waited the time to declare themselves. With such views I cannot wonder that they sought by legal processes to drive them out of the Church. It was a matter of great difficulty to say what was the advisable course to take—to prosecute, or not to prosecute and hope for an improvement and for the prevalence of good sense. I often sympathized with those who countenanced hostile measures, and I still recognize in their proceedings loyalty to the Church. If it is really believed by any one that Ritualism is a mere covert for designs to apostatize to Rome, or to Romanize the Church of England, I think it is only a duty of him who thinks so to attempt to banish such a system from the Church of England.

But I think there is another view to be taken of the case. Granting that the Ritualists were originally imprudent—granting that they introduced some ceremonies which gave just offence, and even shook the faith of some members of the Church—granted that some secessions in consequence took place,—still after all I think the question does not exactly stand as it did thirty years since.

In the first place no one I suppose considers ceremonies as in themselves essentials. It is of no essential moment whether we wear a white, or a red, or a black gown, or whether we turn to the east or the north. But if those

ceremonies indicate adhesion to heresy, or to Romanism, or intention to join either, the case is changed, and we resist and oppose them. If Ritualism, then, means an intention to join the Church of Rome, or adopt its system, it is deserving of prosecution.

But can such a charge be now sustained against Ritualism? Ritualism is a system which, whether originally right or wrong, has preserved for above thirty years its adhesion to the Church of England as a true branch of Christ's holy Catholic Church. Is not a trial of thirty years' standing enough to prove that it is *bonâ fide* attached to the Church of England, and has no *arrière pensée* of joining the Church of Rome? What was there to prevent Ritualists from joining that Church long since on a large scale, when they would have been eagerly received? Simply because they believed the Church of England to be a true Church, and rejected the primary article of the Church of Rome—the Papal supremacy, on which everything else depends. Accordingly, they have been most fiercely attacked by the Ultramontanes for not joining the Church of Rome, and they have withstood all these appeals. The Romanists see that Ritualism revives the Non-juring, not the Romish system.

Moreover, there is no development. They are not a step nearer the Church of Rome than thirty years since. The doctrines they taught thirty years since they teach still. The ritual of thirty years ago is practised still. Therefore I say, that they have by Time been acquitted of all Romish designs against the Church of England; and if so, and if ceremonies are in themselves indifferent, I do not see on what grounds it is necessary to adopt measures for expelling the Ritualists from the Church. The real charge against them is at an end. The ceremonies in use have been long in use; they excite no disturbance, except that which is

got up by opponents by direction from head-quarters. If we look for disturbance, it proceeds from the opponents of Ritualism organized for the purpose, and not from the Ritualists themselves, except when provoked beyond endurance. The object of the opponents is to force a ceremonial on the Ritualists, at the hazard of driving bodies of men out of the Church—possibly weaker brethren—but nevertheless brethren, whom the Church can ill spare.

Therefore, admitting that the prosecuting body was originally and long justified in the course they adopted; and still acknowledging their integrity of intention, and the purity of their motives; it seems to me, that the time has come when long experience having acquitted the Ritualists, they might be left at peace. Should we say that they are Romanizing, when the best book against Romanism that has appeared for the last century, Dr. Littledale's "Plain Reasons" (published by the Christian Knowledge Society), has issued from Ritualism, and when Rome itself regards the Ritualists with indescribable hatred? I am not pretending to vindicate all that is said or done by Ritualists. I know that there is a small but extreme section, which is most questionable in its views—in some cases perhaps directly Roman; but this section is disapproved by the mass of the Ritualists, and it comprises no men of influence; and I think that if left alone it will gradually die out; whereas an attack upon it would probably only extend its influence.

I cannot but hope, that as the time for mutual forbearance has come, the Church may be spared from these continual, irritating, and unseemly contests, which afford such gratification alike to infidels, Dissenters, and Romanists, and which occupy time and energies that would be of infinite value if devoted to the practical work of the Church.

CONCLUSION.

I HAVE thus briefly attempted an outline of the position of the Church of England, embracing a statement of the circumstances under which the Oxford movement of 1833 commenced, and its progress till the publication of the "Narrative" here reprinted brought the Romanizing movement to a crisis, which terminated in its secession from the Church; also an account of the movement of the whole Church, as of an army with banners, which followed.

The whole will have shown the infinite dangers through which the cause of Christianity has passed in this land; perils on all hands, from within and from without; false brethren, weak brethren; a Government sometimes friendly, generally adverse; hosts of enemies, seeking the death of religion; but mightier friends vindicating the truth; and amidst all, a progress unexampled—a Church rising above all opposition, doing the Lord's will more and more effectually—"troubled on every side, yet not distressed; perplexed, but not in despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed; always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body." And we may hence say, "Her foundations are upon the holy hills. The Lord loveth the gates of Sion more than all the dwellings of Jacob. Very excellent things are spoken of thee, thou city of God." Let the Church

of England—the chief surviving bulwark and witness of the Gospel in these days—the Church which loves and spreads abroad God's Scriptures; which abstains from idols and the worship of creatures instead of the Creator—a Church flourishing amidst troubles, and contending boldly against Satan:—let that Church take courage and go on perseveringly in its holy work—giving place by subjection to no false brethren, that the truth of the Gospel might continue with you—adhering to its immutable principles—"stedfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord;" for, "If God be for us, who can be against us?"

THE END.

LONDON :
PRINTED BY GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, LIMITED,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

I.

ORIGINES LITURGICÆ; or, Antiquities of the English Ritual, and a Dissertation on Primitive Liturgies. In 2 vols., 8vo.

II.

A TREATISE ON THE CHURCH OF CHRIST, designed chiefly for the Use of Students in Theology. In 2 vols., 8vo.

III.

THE APOSTOLICAL JURISDICTION AND SUCCESSION OF THE EPISCOPACY IN THE BRITISH CHURCHES, vindicated against the Objections of Dr. Wiseman in the *Dublin Review*. 8vo.

IV.

LETTERS TO N. WISEMAN, D.D., on the Errors of Romanism, in respect to the Worship of Saints, Satisfactions, Purgatory, Indulgences, and the Worship of Images and Relics. To which is added, An Examination of Mr. Sibthorp's Reasons for his Secession from the Church, with a Supplement. 8vo.

V.

RESULTS OF THE EXPOSTULATION OF THE RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, &c. By UMBRA OXONIENSIS. King and Co. 1875.

A Catalogue of Works

IN

THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE

PUBLISHED BY

MESSRS. LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

Abbey and Overton.—THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. By CHARLES J. ABBEY, M.A., Rector of Checkendon, Reading, and JOHN H. OVERTON, M.A., Rector of Epworth, Doncaster, Rural Dean of Isle of Axholme. *Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

Adams.—SACRED ALLEGORIES. The Shadow of the Cross—The Distant Hills—The Old Man's Home—The King's Messengers. By the Rev. WILLIAM ADAMS, M.A. *Crown 8vo.* 5*s.*

The Four Allegories may be had separately, with Illustrations. *16mo. 1s. each. Also the Miniature Edition. Four Vols. 32mo. 1s. each;* in a box, 5*s.*

Aids to the Inner Life.

Edited by the Rev. W. H. HUTCHINGS, M.A., Rector of Kirkby Misperton, Yorkshire. *Five Vols. 32mo, cloth limp, 6d. each; or cloth extra, 1s. each. Sold separately.*
Also an Edition *with red borders, 2s. each.*

OF THE IMITATION OF CHRIST. By THOMAS À KEMPIS. In Four Books.

THE CHRISTIAN YEAR: Thoughts in Verse for the Sundays and Holy Days throughout the Year.

THE DEVOUT LIFE. By ST. FRANCIS DE SALES.

THE HIDDEN LIFE OF THE SOUL. From the French of JEAN NICOLAS GROU.

THE SPIRITUAL COMBAT. Together with the Supplement and the Path of Paradise. By LAURENCE SCUPOLI.

Andrewes.—A MANUAL FOR THE SICK; with other Devotions. By LANCELOT ANDREWES, D.D., sometime Bishop of Winchester. With Preface by H. P. LIDDON, D.D. *24mo. 2s. 6d.*

Augustine.—THE CONFESSIONS OF ST. AUGUSTINE. In Ten Books. Translated and Edited by the Rev. W. H. HUTCHINGS, M.A. *Small* 8*vo.* 5*s.* *Cheap Edition.* 16*mo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

Bathe.—Works by the Rev. ANTHONY BATHE, M.A.

A LENT WITH JESUS. A Plain Guide for Churchmen. Containing Readings for Lent and Easter Week, and on the Holy Eucharist. 32*mo,* 1*s.*; *or in paper cover,* 6*d.*

WHAT I SHOULD BELIEVE. A Simple Manual of Self-Instruction for Church People. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Bickersteth.—Works by EDWARD HENRY BICKERSTETH, D.D., Bishop of Exeter.

THE LORD'S TABLE; or, Meditations on the Holy Communion Office in the Book of Common Prayer. 16*mo.* 1*s.*; *or cloth extra,* 2*s.*

YESTERDAY, TO-DAY, AND FOR EVER: a Poem in Twelve Books.
One Shilling Edition, 18*mo.* *With red borders,* 16*mo,* 2*s.* 6*d.*
The Crown 8*vo Edition* (5*s.*) *may still be had.*

Blunt.—Works by the Rev. JOHN HENRY BLUNT, D.D.

DICTIONARY OF DOCTRINAL AND HISTORICAL THEOLOGY. By various Writers. Edited by the Rev. JOHN HENRY BLUNT, D.D. *Imperial* 8*vo.* 21*s.*

DICTIONARY OF SECTS, HERESIES, ECCLESIASTICAL PARTIES AND SCHOOLS OF RELIGIOUS THOUGHT. By various Writers. Edited by the Rev. JOHN HENRY BLUNT, D.D. *Imperial* 8*vo.* 21*s.*

THE BOOK OF CHURCH LAW. Being an Exposition of the Legal Rights and Duties of the Parochial Clergy and the Laity of the Church of England. Revised by Sir WALTER G. F. PHILLIMORE, Bart., D.C.L. *Crown* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

A COMPANION TO THE BIBLE: Being a Plain Commentary on Scripture History, to the end of the Apostolic Age. *Two vols. small* 8*vo.* *Sold separately.*

THE OLD TESTAMENT. 3*s.* 6*d.* THE NEW TESTAMENT. 3*s.* 6*d.*

HOUSEHOLD THEOLOGY: a Handbook of Religious Information respecting the Holy Bible, the Prayer Book, the Church, the Ministry, Divine Worship, the Creeds, etc. etc. *Paper cover,* 16*mo.* 1*s.* Also the Larger Edition, 3*s.* 6*d.*

Body.—Works by the Rev. GEORGE BODY, D.D., Canon of Durham.

THE SCHOOL OF CALVARY; or, Laws of Christian Life revealed from the Cross. A Course of Lectures delivered in substance at All Saints', Margaret Street. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE LIFE OF JUSTIFICATION: a Series of Lectures delivered in substance at All Saints', Margaret Street. 16*mo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

THE LIFE OF TEMPTATION: a Course of Lectures delivered in substance at St. Peter's, Eaton Square; also at All Saints', Margaret Street. 16*mo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

Boultbee.—A COMMENTARY ON THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By the Rev. T. P. BOULTBEE, formerly Principal of the London College of Divinity, St. John's Hall, Highbury. *Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*

Bright.—Works by WILLIAM BRIGHT, D.D., Canon of Christ Church.

LESSONS FROM THE LIVES OF THREE GREAT FATHERS: St. Athanasius, St. Chrysostom, and St. Augustine. *Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*

THE INCARNATION AS A MOTIVE POWER. *Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*

IONA AND OTHER VERSES. *Small* 8*vo.* 4*s.* 6*d.*

HYMNS AND OTHER VERSES. *Small* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

FAITH AND LIFE: Readings for the greater Holy Days, and the Sundays from Advent to Trinity. Compiled from Ancient Writers. *Small* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

Bright and Medd.—LIBER PRECUM PUBLICARUM ECCLESIÆ ANGLICANÆ. A GULIELMO BRIGHT, S.T.P., et PETRO GOLDSMITH MEDD, A.M., Latine redditus. [In hac Editione continentur Versiones Latinæ—1. Libri Precum Publicarum Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ; 2. Liturgiæ Primæ Reformatæ; 3. Liturgiæ Scoticanæ; 4. Liturgiæ Americanæ.] *Small* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Browne.—AN EXPOSITION OF THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES, Historical and Doctrinal. By E. H. BROWNE, D.D., formerly Bishop of Winchester. 8*vo.* 16*s.*

Campion and Beamont.—THE PRAYER BOOK INTERLEAVED. With Historical Illustrations and Explanatory Notes arranged parallel to the Text. By W. M. CAMPION, D.D., and W. J. BEAMONT, M.A. *Small* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Carter.—Works edited by the Rev. T. T. CARTER, M.A., Hon. Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.

THE TREASURY OF DEVOTION: a Manual of Prayer for General and Daily Use. Compiled by a Priest. 18*mo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*; *cloth limp*, 2*s.*; *or bound with the Book of Common Prayer*, 3*s.* 6*d.* *Large-Type Edition.* *Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

THE WAY OF LIFE: A Book of Prayers and Instruction for the Young at School, with a Preparation for Confirmation. Compiled by a Priest. 18*mo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*

THE PATH OF HOLINESS: a First Book of Prayers, with the Service of the Holy Communion, for the Young. Compiled by a Priest. With Illustrations. 16*mo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*; *cloth limp*, 1*s.*

THE GUIDE TO HEAVEN: a Book of Prayers for every Want. (For the Working Classes.) Compiled by a Priest. 18*mo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*; *cloth limp*, 1*s.* *Large-Type Edition.* *Crown* 8*vo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*; *cloth limp*, 1*s.*

[*continued.*

Carter.—Works edited by the Rev. T. T. CARTER, M.A., Hon. Canon of Christ Church, Oxford—*continued.*

SELF-RENUNCIATION. From the French. 16*mo.* 2*s.* 6*d.* *Also the Larger Edition. Small* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE STAR OF CHILDHOOD; a First Book of Prayers and Instruction for Children. Compiled by a Priest. With Illustrations. 16*mo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

Carter.—MAXIMS AND GLEANINGS FROM THE WRITINGS OF T. T. CARTER, M.A. Selected and arranged for Daily Use. *Crown* 16*mo.* 2*s.*

Compton.—THE ARMOURY OF PRAYER. A Book of Devotion. Compiled by the Rev. BERDMORE COMPTON, M.A. 18*mo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Conybeare and Howson.—THE LIFE AND EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL. By the Rev. W. J. CONYBEARE, M.A., and the Very Rev. J. S. HOWSON, D.D. With numerous Maps and Illustrations.

LIBRARY EDITION. *Two Vols.* 8*vo.* 21*s.*

STUDENT'S EDITION. *One Vol. Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*

Crake.—HISTORY OF THE CHURCH UNDER THE ROMAN EMPIRE, A.D. 30-476. By the Rev. A. D. CRAKE, B.A. *Crown* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Creighton.—HISTORY OF THE PAPACY DURING THE REFORMATION. By MANDELL CREIGHTON, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Peterborough. 8*vo.* *Vols. I. and II.*, 1378-1464, 32*s.* *Vols. III. and IV.*, 1464-1518, 24*s.*

Devotional Series, 16mo, Red Borders. *Each* 2*s.* 6*d.*

BICKERSTETH'S YESTERDAY, TO-DAY, AND FOR EVER.
CHILCOT'S EVIL THOUGHTS.
CHRISTIAN YEAR.
DEVOTIONAL BIRTHDAY BOOK.
HERBERT'S POEMS AND PROVERBS.
KEMPIS' (À) OF THE IMITATION OF CHRIST.
ST. FRANCIS DE SALES' THE DEVOUT LIFE.
WILSON'S THE LORD'S SUPPER. *Large type.*
*TAYLOR'S (JEREMY) HOLY LIVING.
*—— —— HOLY DYING.

** These two in one Volume.* 5*s.*

Devotional Series, 18mo, without Red Borders. *Each* 1*s.*

BICKERSTETH'S YESTERDAY, TO-DAY, AND FOR EVER.
CHRISTIAN YEAR.
KEMPIS' (À) OF THE IMITATION OF CHRIST.
WILSON'S THE LORD'S SUPPER. *Large type.*
*TAYLOR'S (JEREMY) HOLY LIVING.
*—— —— HOLY DYING.

** These two in one Volume.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

Edersheim.—Works by ALFRED EDERSHEIM, M.A., D.D., Ph.D., sometime Grinfield Lecturer on the Septuagint, Oxford.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF JESUS THE MESSIAH. *Two Vols.* 8*vo.* 24*s.*

JESUS THE MESSIAH: being an Abridged Edition of 'The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah.' *Crown* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

PROPHECY AND HISTORY IN RELATION TO THE MESSIAH: The Warburton Lectures, 1880-1884. 8*vo.* 12*s.*

TOHU-VA-VOHU ('Without Form and Void'): being a collection of Fragmentary Thoughts and Criticism. *Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*

Ellicott.—Works by C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D., Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.

A CRITICAL AND GRAMMATICAL COMMENTARY ON ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES. Greek Text, with a Critical and Grammatical Commentary, and a Revised English Translation. 8*vo.*

1 CORINTHIANS. 16*s.*

GALATIANS. 8*s.* 6*d.*

EPHESIANS. 8*s.* 6*d.*

PASTORAL EPISTLES. 10*s.* 6*d.*

PHILIPPIANS, COLOSSIANS, AND PHILEMON. 10*s.* 6*d.*

THESSALONIANS. 7*s.* 6*d.*

HISTORICAL LECTURES ON THE LIFE OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. 8*vo.* 12*s.*

Epochs of Church History. Edited by MANDELL CREIGHTON, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Peterborough. *Fcap.* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.* *each.*

THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN OTHER LANDS. By the Rev. H. W. TUCKER, M.A.

THE HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND. By the Rev. GEO. G. PERRY, M.A.

THE CHURCH OF THE EARLY FATHERS. By the Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.

THE EVANGELICAL REVIVAL IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. By the Rev. J. H. OVERTON, M.A.

THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD. By the Hon. G. C. BRODRICK, D.C.L.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE. By J. BASS MULLINGER M.A.

THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN THE MIDDLE AGES. By the Rev. W. HUNT, M.A.

THE CHURCH AND THE EASTERN EMPIRE. By the Rev. H. F. TOZER, M.A.

THE CHURCH AND THE ROMAN EMPIRE. By the Rev. A. CARR.

THE CHURCH AND THE PURITANS, 1570-1660. By HENRY OFFLEY WAKEMAN, M.A.

HILDEBRAND AND HIS TIMES By the Rev. W. R. W. STEPHENS, M.A

THE POPES AND THE HOHENSTAUFEN. By UGO BALZANI.

THE COUNTER-REFORMATION. By ADOLPHUS WILLIAM WARD, Litt. D.

WYCLIFFE AND MOVEMENTS FOR REFORM. By REGINALD L. POOLE, M.A.

THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY. By H. M. GWATKIN, M.A.

Fosbery.—Works edited by the Rev. THOMAS VINCENT FOSBERY, M.A., sometime Vicar of St. Giles's, Reading.

VOICES OF COMFORT. *Cheap Edition. Small 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*
The Larger Edition (7*s.* 6*d.*) *may still be had.*

HYMNS AND POEMS FOR THE SICK AND SUFFERING. In connection with the Service for the Visitation of the Sick. Selected from Various Authors. *Small 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Garland.—THE PRACTICAL TEACHING OF THE APOCALYPSE. By the Rev. G. V. GARLAND, M.A. *8vo.* 16*s.*

Gore.—Works by the Rev. CHARLES GORE, M.A., Principal of the Pusey House; Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford.

THE MINISTRY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. *8vo.* 10*s.* 6*d.*

ROMAN CATHOLIC CLAIMS. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Goulburn.—Works by EDWARD MEYRICK GOULBURN, D.D., D.C.L., sometime Dean of Norwich.

THOUGHTS ON PERSONAL RELIGION. *Small 8vo,* 6*s.* 6*d.*; *Cheap Edition,* 3*s.* 6*d.*; *Presentation Edition, 2 vols. small 8vo,* 10*s.* 6*d.*

THE PURSUIT OF HOLINESS: a Sequel to 'Thoughts on Personal Religion.' *Small 8vo.* 5*s.* *Cheap Edition,* 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE CHILD SAMUEL: a Practical and Devotional Commentary on the Birth and Childhood of the Prophet Samuel, as recorded in 1 Sam. i., ii. 1-27, iii. *Small 8vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

THE GOSPEL OF THE CHILDHOOD: a Practical and Devotional Commentary on the Single Incident of our Blessed Lord's Childhood (St. Luke ii. 41 to the end). *Crown 8vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

THE COLLECTS OF THE DAY: an Exposition, Critical and Devotional, of the Collects appointed at the Communion. With Preliminary Essays on their Structure, Sources, etc. 2 *vols. Crown 8vo.* 8*s. each.*

THOUGHTS UPON THE LITURGICAL GOSPELS for the Sundays, one for each day in the year. With an Introduction on their Origin, History, the Modifications made in them by the Reformers and by the Revisers of the Prayer Book. 2 *vols. Crown 8vo.* 16*s.*

MEDITATIONS UPON THE LITURGICAL GOSPELS for the Minor Festivals of Christ, the two first Week-days of the Easter and Whitsun Festivals, and the Red-letter Saints' Days. *Crown 8vo.* 8*s.* 6*d.*

FAMILY PRAYERS compiled from various sources (chiefly from Bishop Hamilton's Manual), and arranged on the Liturgical Principle. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.* *Cheap Edition. 16mo.* 1*s.*

Haddan.—APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By the Rev. ARTHUR W. HADDAN, B.D., late Rector of Barton-on-the-Heath. *8vo.* 12*s.*

Hatch.—THE ORGANIZATION OF THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCHES. Being the Bampton Lectures for 1880. By EDWIN HATCH, M.A., D.D. *8vo.* 5*s.*

Hernaman.—LYRA CONSOLATIONIS. From the Poets of the Seventeenth, Eighteenth, and Nineteenth Centuries. Selected and arranged by CLAUDIA FRANCES HERNAMAN. *Small 8vo.* 6*s.*

Holland.—Works by the Rev. HENRY SCOTT HOLLAND, M.A., Canon and Precentor of St. Paul's.

CREED AND CHARACTER: Sermons. *Crown 8vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

ON BEHALF OF BELIEF. Sermons preached in St. Paul's Cathedral. *Crown 8vo.* 6*s.*

CHRIST OR ECCLESIASTES. Sermons preached in St. Paul's Cathedral. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

GOOD FRIDAY. Being Addresses on the Seven Last Words, delivered at St. Paul's Cathedral on Good Friday. *Small 8vo.* 2*s.*

LOGIC AND LIFE, with other Sermons. *Crown 8vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Hopkins.—CHRIST THE CONSOLER. A Book of Comfort for the Sick. By ELLICE HOPKINS. *Small 8vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

James.—COMMENT UPON THE COLLECTS appointed to be used in the Church of England on Sundays and Holy Days throughout the Year. By JOHN JAMES, D.D., sometime Canon of Peterborough. *Small 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Jameson.—Works by Mrs. JAMESON.

SACRED AND LEGENDARY ART, containing Legends of the Angels and Archangels, the Evangelists, the Apostles, the Doctors of the Church, St. Mary Magdalene, the Patron Saints, the Martyrs, the Early Bishops, the Hermits, and the Warrior-Saints of Christendom, as represented in the Fine Arts. With 19 etchings on Copper and Steel, and 187 Woodcuts. *Two Vols. Cloth, gilt top,* 20*s. net.*

LEGENDS OF THE MONASTIC ORDERS, as represented in the Fine Arts, comprising the Benedictines and Augustines, and Orders derived from their Rules, the Mendicant Orders, the Jesuits, and the Order of the Visitation of S. Mary. With 11 etchings by the Author, and 88 Woodcuts. *One Vol. Cloth, gilt top,* 10*s. net.*

LEGENDS OF THE MADONNA, OR BLESSED VIRGIN MARY. Devotional with and without the Infant Jesus, Historical from the Annunciation to the Assumption, as represented in Sacred and Legendary Christian Art. With 27 Etchings and 165 Woodcuts. *One Vol. Cloth, gilt top,* 10*s. net.*

THE HISTORY OF OUR LORD, as exemplified in Works of Art, with that of His Types, St. John the Baptist, and other Persons of the Old and New Testaments. Commenced by the late Mrs. JAMESON; continued and completed by LADY EASTLAKE. With 31 etchings and 281 Woodcuts. *Two Vols. 8vo.* 20*s. net.*

Jennings.—ECCLESIA ANGLICANA. A History of the Church of Christ in England from the Earliest to the Present Times. By the Rev. ARTHUR CHARLES JENNINGS, M.A. *Crown* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Jukes.—Works by ANDREW JUKES.

THE NEW MAN AND THE ETERNAL LIFE. Notes on the Reiterated Amens of the Son of God. *Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*

THE NAMES OF GOD IN HOLY SCRIPTURE: a Revelation of His Nature and Relationships. *Crown* 8*vo.* 4*s.* 6*d.*

THE TYPES OF GENESIS. *Crown* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

THE SECOND DEATH AND THE RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE MYSTERY OF THE KINGDOM. *Crown* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

Keble.—MAXIMS AND GLEANINGS FROM THE WRITINGS OF JOHN KEBLE, M.A. Selected and Arranged for Daily Use. By C. M. S. *Crown* 16*mo.* 2*s.*

SELECTIONS FROM THE WRITINGS OF JOHN KEBLE, M.A. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Kennaway.—CONSOLATIO; OR, COMFORT FOR THE AFFLICTED. Edited by the late Rev. C. E. KENNAWAY. 16*mo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

Knox Little.—Works by W. J. KNOX LITTLE, M.A., Canon Residentiary of Worcester, and Vicar of Hoar Cross.

THE CHRISTIAN HOME. *Crown* 8*vo.*

THE HOPES AND DECISIONS OF THE PASSION OF OUR MOST HOLY REDEEMER. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE THREE HOURS' AGONY OF OUR BLESSED REDEEMER. Being Addresses in the form of Meditations delivered in St. Alban's Church, Manchester, on Good Friday, 1877. *Small* 8*vo.* 2*s.*; *or in Paper Cover*, 1*s.*

CHARACTERISTICS AND MOTIVES OF THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. Ten Sermons preached in Manchester Cathedral, in Lent and Advent 1877. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

SERMONS PREACHED FOR THE MOST PART IN MANCHESTER. *Crown* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

THE MYSTERY OF THE PASSION OF OUR MOST HOLY REDEEMER. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE WITNESS OF THE PASSION OF OUR MOST HOLY REDEEMER. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE LIGHT OF LIFE. Sermons preached on Various Occasions. *Crown* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

SUNLIGHT AND SHADOW IN THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. Sermons preached for the most part in America. *Crown* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Lear.—Works by, and Edited by, H. L. SIDNEY LEAR.

CHRISTIAN BIOGRAPHIES. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d. each.*

MADAME LOUISE DE FRANCE, Daughter of Louis XV., known also as the Mother Térèse de St. Augustin.

FOR DAYS AND YEARS. A Book containing a Text, Short Reading, and Hymn for Every Day in the Church's Year. 16*mo.* 2*s.* 6*d. Also a Cheap Edition, 32mo.* 1*s.*; *or cloth gilt,* 1*s.* 6*d.*

FIVE MINUTES. Daily Readings of Poetry. 16*mo.* 3*s.* 6*d. Also a Cheap Edition. 32mo.* 1*s.*; *or cloth gilt,* 1*s.* 6*d.*

WEARINESS. A Book for the Languid and Lonely. *Large Type. Small 8vo.* 5*s.*

THE LIGHT OF THE CONSCIENCE. 16*mo.* 2*s.* 6*d. Also the Larger Edition. Crown 8vo.* 5*s.*

A DOMINICAN ARTIST: a Sketch of the Life of the Rev. Père Besson, of the Order of St. Dominic.

HENRI PERREYVE. By A. GRATRY.

ST. FRANCIS DE SALES, Bishop and Prince of Geneva.

THE REVIVAL OF PRIESTLY LIFE IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY IN FRANCE.

A CHRISTIAN PAINTER OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

BOSSUET AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES.

FÉNELON, ARCHBISHOP OF CAMBRAI.

HENRI DOMINIQUE LACORDAIRE.

DEVOTIONAL WORKS. Edited by H. L. SIDNEY LEAR. *New and Uniform Editions. Nine Vols.* 16*mo.* 2*s.* 6*d. each.*

FÉNELON'S SPIRITUAL LETTERS TO MEN.

FÉNELON'S SPIRITUAL LETTERS TO WOMEN.

A SELECTION FROM THE SPIRITUAL LETTERS OF ST. FRANCIS DE SALES.

THE SPIRIT OF ST. FRANCIS DE SALES.

THE HIDDEN LIFE OF THE SOUL.

THE LIGHT OF THE CONSCIENCE.

SELF-RENUNCIATION. From the French.

ST. FRANCIS DE SALES' OF THE LOVE OF GOD.

SELECTIONS FROM PASCAL'S THOUGHTS.

Library of Spiritual Works for English Catholics. *Original Edition. With Red Borders. Small 8vo.* 5*s. each. New and Cheaper Editions.* 16*mo.* 2*s.* 6*d. each.*

OF THE IMITATION OF CHRIST.

THE SPIRITUAL COMBAT. By LAURENCE SCUPOLI.

THE DEVOUT LIFE. By ST. FRANCIS DE SALES.

OF THE LOVE OF GOD. By ST. FRANCIS DE SALES.

THE CONFESSIONS OF ST. AUGUSTINE. *In Ten Books.*

THE CHRISTIAN YEAR. 5*s. Edition only.*

Liddon.—Works by HENRY PARRY LIDDON, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., late Canon Residentiary and Chancellor of St. Paul's.

THE DIVINITY OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST. Being the Bampton Lectures for 1866. *Crown 8vo.* 5*s.*

ADVENT IN ST. PAUL'S. Sermons bearing chiefly on the Two Comings of our Lord. *Two Vols. Crown 8vo.* 5*s. each. Cheap edition in one Volume. Crown 8vo.* 5*s.*

CHRISTMASTIDE IN ST. PAUL'S. Sermons bearing chiefly on the Birth of our Lord and the End of the Year. *Crown 8vo.* 5*s.*

PASSIONTIDE SERMONS. *Crown 8vo.* 5*s.*

EASTER IN ST. PAUL'S. Sermons bearing chiefly on the Resurrection of our Lord. *Two Vols. Crown 8vo.* 5*s. each. Cheap Edition in one Volume. Crown 8vo.* 5*s.*

SERMONS PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD. *Two Vols. Crown 8vo.* 5*s. each. Cheap Edition in one Volume. Crown 8vo.* 5*s.*

THE MAGNIFICAT. Sermons in St. Paul's. *Crown 8vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

SOME ELEMENTS OF RELIGION. Lent Lectures. *Small 8vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.* ; *or in Paper Cover,* 1*s.* 6*d.*

The Crown 8vo Edition (5*s.*) *may still be had.*

SELECTIONS FROM THE WRITINGS OF H. P. LIDDON, D.D. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

MAXIMS AND GLEANINGS FROM THE WRITINGS OF H. P. LIDDON, D.D. Selected and arranged by C. M. S. *Crown 16mo.* 2*s.*

Littlehales.—Works Edited by HENRY LTTLEHALES.

A FOURTEENTH CENTURY PRAYER BOOK: being Pages in Facsimile from a Layman's Prayer Book in English about 1400 A.D. *4to.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE PRYMER OR PRAYER-BOOK OF THE LAY PEOPLE IN THE MIDDLE AGES. In English, dating about 1400 A.D. Part I. Text. *Royal 8vo.* 5*s.*

Luckock.—Works by HERBERT MORTIMER LUCKOCK, D.D., Canon of Ely.

AFTER DEATH. An Examination of the Testimony of Primitive Times respecting the State of the Faithful Dead, and their Relationship to the Living. *Crown 8vo.* 6*s.*

THE INTERMEDIATE STATE BETWEEN DEATH AND JUDGMENT. Being a Sequel to *After Death. Crown 8vo.* 6*s.*

FOOTPRINTS OF THE SON OF MAN, as traced by St. Mark. Being Eighty Portions for Private Study, Family Reading, and Instructions in Church. *Two Vols. Crown 8vo.* 12*s. Cheap Edition in one Vol. Crown 8vo.* 5*s.*

[*continued.*

Luckock.—Works by HERBERT MORTIMER LUCKOCK, D.D., Canon of Ely—*continued.*

THE DIVINE LITURGY. Being the Order for Holy Communion, Historically, Doctrinally, and Devotionally set forth, in Fifty Portions. *Crown 8vo.* 6*s.*

STUDIES IN THE HISTORY OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER. The Anglican Reform—The Puritan Innovations—The Elizabethan Reaction—The Caroline Settlement. With Appendices. *Crown 8vo.* 6*s.*

THE BISHOPS IN THE TOWER. A Record of Stirring Events affecting the Church and Nonconformists from the Restoration to the Revolution. *Crown 8vo.* 6*s.*

LYRA APOSTOLICA. Poems by J. W. BOWDEN, R. H. FROUDE, J. KEBLE, J. H. NEWMAN, R. I. WILBERFORCE, and I. WILLIAMS; and New Preface by CARDINAL NEWMAN. *16mo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

LYRA GERMANICA. Hymns translated from the German by CATHERINE WINKWORTH. *Small 8vo.* 5*s.*

MacColl.—CHRISTIANITY IN RELATION TO SCIENCE AND MORALS. By the Rev. MALCOLM MACCOLL, M.A., Canon Residentiary of Ripon. *Crown 8vo.* 6*s.*

Mason.—Works by A. J. MASON, D.D., formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

THE FAITH OF THE GOSPEL. A Manual of Christian Doctrine. *Crown 8vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.* *Large-Paper Edition for Marginal Notes.* *4to.* 12*s.* 6*d.*

THE RELATION OF CONFIRMATION TO BAPTISM. As taught by the Western Fathers. A Study in the History of Doctrine. *Crown 8vo.*

Mercier.—Works by Mrs. JEROME MERCIER.

OUR MOTHER CHURCH: being Simple Talk on High Topics. *Small 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE STORY OF SALVATION: or, Thoughts on the Historic Study of the Bible. *Small 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Moberly.—Works by GEORGE MOBERLY, D.C.L., late Bishop of Salisbury.

PLAIN SERMONS. Preached at Brighstone. *Crown 8vo.* 5*s.*

THE SAYINGS OF THE GREAT FORTY DAYS, between the Resurrection and Ascension, regarded as the Outlines of the Kingdom of God. In Five Discourses. *Crown 8vo.* 5*s.*

PAROCHIAL SERMONS. Mostly preached at Brighstone. *Crown 8vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

SERMONS PREACHED AT WINCHESTER COLLEGE. *Two Vols. Small 8vo.* 6*s.* 6*d. each.*

Mozley.—Works by J. B. MOZLEY, D.D., late Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford.

ESSAYS, HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL. *Two Vols.* 8*vo.* 24*s.*

EIGHT LECTURES ON MIRACLES. Being the Bampton Lectures for 1865. *Crown* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

RULING IDEAS IN EARLY AGES AND THEIR RELATION TO OLD TESTAMENT FAITH. Lectures delivered to Graduates of the University of Oxford. 8*vo.* 10*s.* 6*d.*

SERMONS PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, and on Various Occasions. *Crown* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

SERMONS, PAROCHIAL AND OCCASIONAL. *Crown* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Mozley.—Works by the Rev. T. MOZLEY, M.A., Author of 'Reminiscences of Oriel College and the Oxford Movement.'

THE WORD. *Crown* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

LETTERS FROM ROME ON THE OCCASION OF THE ŒCUMENICAL COUNCIL 1869-1870. *Two Vols. Cr.* 8*vo.* 18*s.*

Newbolt.—Works by the Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, Canon Residentiary of St. Paul's.

THE FRUIT OF THE SPIRIT. Being Ten Addresses bearing on the Spiritual Life. *Crown* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

THE MAN OF GOD. Being Six Addresses delivered during Lent 1886, at the Primary Ordination of the Right Rev. the Lord Alwyne Compton, Bishop of Ely. *Small* 8*vo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*

COUNSELS OF FAITH AND PRACTICE. Being Sermons preached on Various Occasions. 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

THE VOICE OF THE PRAYER BOOK. Being Spiritual Addresses bearing on the Book of Common Prayer. *Crown* 8*vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

Newnham.—THE ALL-FATHER: Sermons preached in a Village Church. By the Rev. H. P. NEWNHAM. With Preface by EDNA LYALL. *Crown* 8*vo.* 4*s.* 6*d.*

Newman.—Works by JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, B.D. (Cardinal Newman), formerly Vicar of St. Mary's, Oxford.

PAROCHIAL AND PLAIN SERMONS. *Eight Vols. Cabinet Edition. Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s. each. Popular Edition. Eight Vols. Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d. each.*

[*continued.*

Newman.—Works by JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, B.D. (Cardinal Newman), formerly Vicar of St. Mary's, Oxford—*continued.*

SELECTION, ADAPTED TO THE SEASONS OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL YEAR, from the 'Parochial and Plain Sermons.' *Crown 8vo.* 5*s.*

FIFTEEN SERMONS PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, between A.D. 1826 and 1843. *Crown 8vo.* 5*s.*

SERMONS BEARING UPON SUBJECTS OF THE DAY. *Crown 8vo.* 5*s.*

LECTURES ON THE DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION. *Crown 8vo.* 5*s.*

*** *For other Works by Cardinal Newman, see Messrs. Longmans & Co.'s Catalogue of Works in General Literature.*

THE LETTERS AND CORRESPONDENCE OF JOHN HENRY NEWMAN DURING HIS LIFE IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH. With a Brief Autobiographical Memoir. Arranged and Edited by ANNE MOZLEY. *Two Vols. 8vo.* 30*s. net.*

Osborne.—Works by EDWARD OSBORNE, Mission Priest of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, Cowley, Oxford.

THE CHILDREN'S SAVIOUR. Instructions to Children on the Life of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. *Illustrated.* 16*mo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE SAVIOUR-KING. Instructions to Children on Old Testament Types and Illustrations of the Life of Christ. *Illustrated.* 16*mo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE CHILDREN'S FAITH. Instructions to Children on the Apostles' Creed. *With Illustrations.* 16*mo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Oxenden.—Works by the Right Rev. ASHTON OXENDEN, formerly Bishop of Montreal.

THE PATHWAY OF SAFETY; or, Counsel to the Awakened. *Fcap. 8vo, large type.* 2*s.* 6*d.* *Cheap Edition. Small type, limp.* 1*s.*

THE EARNEST COMMUNICANT. *Common Edition.* 32*mo.* 1*s.* *New Red Rubric Edition.* 32*mo.* 2*s.*

OUR CHURCH AND HER SERVICES. *Fcap. 8vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

FAMILY PRAYERS FOR FOUR WEEKS. First Series. *Fcap. 8vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.* Second Series. *Fcap. 8vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

LARGE TYPE EDITION. Two Series in one Volume. *Crown 8vo.* 6*s.*

COTTAGE SERMONS; or, Plain Words to the Poor. *Fcap. 8vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

THOUGHTS FOR HOLY WEEK. 16*mo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*

DECISION. 18*mo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*

continued.

Oxenden.—Works by the Right Rev. ASHTON OXENDEN, formerly Bishop of Montreal—*continued.*

THE HOME BEYOND; or, A Happy Old Age. *Fcap.* 8*vo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*

THE LABOURING MAN'S BOOK. 18*mo, large type, cloth.* 1*s.* 6*d.*

PEACE AND ITS HINDRANCES. *Cr.* 8*vo.* 1*s. paper cover*; 2*s. cloth.*

CONFIRMATION. 18*mo, cloth*, 9*d*; *sewed*, 3*d.*; *or* 2*s.* 6*d. per dozen.*

COUNSELS TO THOSE WHO HAVE BEEN CONFIRMED; or, Now is the Time to serve Christ. 18*mo, cloth.* 1*s.*

THE LORD'S SUPPER SIMPLY EXPLAINED. 18*mo, cloth.* 1*s.* *Cheap Edition. Paper.* 6*d.*

PRAYERS FOR PRIVATE USE. 32*mo, cloth.* 1*s.*

WORDS OF PEACE; or, The Blessings of Sickness. 16*mo, cloth.* 1*s.*

Paget.—Works by the Rev. FRANCIS PAGET, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology.

THE SPIRIT OF DISCIPLINE: Sermons. *Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.* 6*d.*

FACULTIES AND DIFFICULTIES FOR BELIEF AND DISBELIEF. *Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.* 6*d.*

THE HALLOWING OF WORK. Addresses given at Eton, January 16-18, 1888. *Small* 8*vo.* 2*s.*

PRACTICAL REFLECTIONS. By a CLERGYMAN. With Prefaces by H. P. LIDDON, D.D., D.C.L. *Crown* 8*vo.*

Vol. I.—THE HOLY GOSPELS. 4*s.* 6*d.*
Vol. II.—ACTS TO REVELATION. 6*s.*
THE PSALMS. 5*s.*

PRIEST (THE) TO THE ALTAR; Or, Aids to the Devout Celebration of Holy Communion, chiefly after the Ancient English Use of Sarum. *Royal* 8*vo.* 12*s.*

Pusey.—Works by the late Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D.

MAXIMS AND GLEANINGS FROM THE WRITINGS OF EDWARD BOUVERIE PUSEY, D.D. Selected and Arranged for Daily Use. By C. M. S. *Crown* 16*mo.* 2*s.*

PRIVATE PRAYERS. With Preface by H. P. LIDDON, D.D. 32*mo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

PRAYERS FOR A YOUNG SCHOOLBOY. Edited, with a Preface, by H. P. LIDDON, D.D. 24*mo.* 1*s.*

SELECTIONS FROM THE WRITINGS OF EDWARD BOUVERIE PUSEY, D.D. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Richmond.—CHRISTIAN ECONOMICS. By the Rev. WILFRID RICHMOND, M.A., sometime Warden of Trinity College, Glenalmond. *Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*

Sanday.—THE ORACLES OF GOD: Nine Lectures on the Nature and Extent of Biblical Inspiration and the Special Significance of the Old Testament Scriptures at the Present Time. By W. SANDAY, M.A., D.D., LL.D. *Crown* 8*vo.* 4*s.*

Seebohm.—THE OXFORD REFORMERS—JOHN COLET, ERASMUS, AND THOMAS MORE: A History of their Fellow-Work. By FREDERICK SEEBOHM. 8*vo.* 14*s.*

Stephen.—ESSAYS IN ECCLESIASTICAL BIOGRAPHY. By the Right Hon. Sir J. STEPHEN. *Crown* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Swayne.—THE BLESSED DEAD IN PARADISE. Four All Saints' Day Sermons, preached in Salisbury Cathedral. By ROBERT G. SWAYNE, M.A. *Crown* 8*vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Tweddell.—THE SOUL IN CONFLICT. A Practical Examination of some Difficulties and Duties of the Spiritual Life. By MARSHALL TWEDDELL, M.A., Vicar of St. Saviour, Paddington. *Crown* 8*vo.* 6*s.*

Twells.—COLLOQUIES ON PREACHING. By HENRY TWELLS, M.A., Honorary Canon of Peterborough *Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s.*

Wakeman.—THE HISTORY OF RELIGION IN ENGLAND. By HENRY OFFLEY WAKEMAN, M.A. *Small* 8*vo.* 1*s.* 6*d.*

Welldon.—THE FUTURE AND THE PAST. Sermons preached to Harrow Boys. (*First Series*, 1885 *and* 1886.) By the Rev. J. E. C. WELLDON, M.A., Head Master of Harrow School. *Crown* 8*vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

Williams.—Works by the Rev. ISAAC WILLIAMS, B.D., formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford.

A DEVOTIONAL COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL NARRATIVE. *Eight Vols. Crown* 8*vo.* 5*s. each. Sold separately.*

THOUGHTS ON THE STUDY OF THE HOLY GOSPELS.
A HARMONY OF THE FOUR GOSPELS.
OUR LORD'S NATIVITY.
OUR LORD'S MINISTRY (Second Year).
OUR LORD'S MINISTRY (Third Year).
THE HOLY WEEK.
OUR LORD'S PASSION.
OUR LORD'S RESURRECTION.

[*continued.*

Williams.—Works by the Rev. ISAAC WILLIAMS, B.D., formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford—*continued.*

FEMALE CHARACTERS OF HOLY SCRIPTURE. A Series of Sermons. *Crown 8vo.* 5*s.*

THE CHARACTERS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. A Series of Sermons. *Crown 8vo.* 5*s.*

THE APOCALYPSE. With Notes and Reflections. *Crown 8vo.* 5*s.*

SERMONS ON THE EPISTLES AND GOSPELS FOR THE SUNDAYS AND HOLY DAYS THROUGHOUT THE YEAR. *Two Vols. Crown 8vo.* 5*s. each.*

PLAIN SERMONS ON THE CATECHISM. *Two Vols. Crown 8vo.* 5*s. each.*

SELECTIONS FROM THE WRITINGS OF ISAAC WILLIAMS, B.D. *Crown 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Woodford.—Works by JAMES RUSSELL WOODFORD, D.D., sometime Lord Bishop of Ely.

THE GREAT COMMISSION. Twelve Addresses on the Ordinal. Edited with an Introduction on the Ordinations of his Episcopate, by HERBERT MORTIMER LUCKOCK, D.D. *Crown 8vo.* 5*s.*

SERMONS ON OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT SUBJECTS. Edited by HERBERT MORTIMER LUCKOCK, D.D. *Two Vols. Crown 8vo.* 5*s. each.*

Woodruff.—THE CHILDREN'S YEAR. Verses for the Sundays and Holy Days throughout the Year. By C. H. WOODRUFF B.C.L. With an Introduction by the LORD BISHOP OF SOUTHWELL *Fcap. 8vo.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

Wordsworth.—

For List of Works by the late Christopher Wordsworth, D.D., Bishop of Lincoln, see Messrs. Longmans & Co.'s Catalogue of Theological Works, 32 pp. Sent post free on application.

Wordsworth.—Works by ELIZABETH WORDSWORTH, Principal of Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE CREED. *Crown 8vo.* 5*s.*

CHRISTOPHER AND OTHER POEMS. *Crown 8vo.* 6*s.*

Younghusband.—Works by FRANCES YOUNGHUSBAND.

THE STORY OF OUR LORD, told in Simple Language for Children. With 25 Illustrations on Wood from Pictures by the Old Masters, and numerous Ornamental Borders, Initial Letters, etc., from Longmans' New Testament. *Crown 8vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

THE STORY OF GENESIS, told in Simple Language for Children. *Crown 8vo.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

Printed by T. and A. CONSTABLE, Printers to Her Majesty,
at the Edinburgh University Press.

Date Due

MAR 4 1997

MAY 0 3 2003

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01080 1084